This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 08166770 5

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

FOR

APRIL 1907 : JULY 1907

EDITED BY

ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON

VOLUME LXIV

LONDON

SPOTTISWOODE & CO. LTD., NEW-STREET SQUARE, E.C.

1907

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
368871
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
R 190 L

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW: PAST AND PRESENT (OCTOBER 1875–APRIL 1907)	1
ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS	13
NEW COLLEGE AND KING'S: A STUDY IN REFORM	39
THE BENEDICTINE ABBEY OF WESTMINSTER. By the Dean of Westminster	58
THE CHURCH OF DENMARK. By C. E. Flöystrup, Copenhagen.	80
PALLADIUS AND EGYPTIAN MONASTICISM. By E. W. Watson	105
LONDON HOME INDUSTRIES AND THE SWEATING OF WOMEN'S LABOUR. By Thomas Holmes	128
EURIPIDES AND HIS MODERN INTERPRETERS. By E. D. A. Morshead	156
THE GOSPEL HISTORY AND ITS TRANSMISSION	169
THE RELIGIOUS CRISIS IN FRANCE: SOME PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS. By the Comtesse de Franqueville (Lady Sophia Palmer)	198
THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM	257
ST. DAVID AND THE EARLY WELSH SAINTS. By H. M. Vaughan	277
WILLIAM ARCHER BUTLER	301
EVOLUTION AND MORALITY. By F. B. Jevons, D.Litt.	331
THE THEOLOGY OF THE WISDOM LITERATURE	342
THE UNPOPULARITY OF THE ABBEYS. By Miss M. Bramston	370
BOOKS ABOUT CHILDREN	391
THE NEW THEOLOGY	409
SHORT NOTICES	224, 435
INDEX	501

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº CXXVII. *APRIL* 1907.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW: PAST AND PRESENT.

OCTOBER 1875–APRIL 1907.

IT is just thirty-two years since a circular letter issued by Mr. A. J. B. Beresford Hope and Dean Church announced on February 5, 1875, the determination to found the *Church Quarterly Review* to 'contain original articles on religious, theological, Biblical, liturgical and ecclesiastical subjects; full reviews and also short notices of books and communications.' The original promoters recognized the desire which was keenly felt at the time for a Review which 'might set forth the results of real study and reflection on the highest of all subjects, in such a manner as to be worthily representative of the teaching and position of the Church of England and of other Churches in full communion with her,' and urged that 'considering the revived energy of the great Anglican Communion, and the keen interest everywhere displayed in religious subjects, it ought certainly to be possible to create and to maintain such an organ. Other religious bodies, and even sceptics, have shown their ability to plan and carry out such a design.'

As we enter with the present number upon our sixty-fourth volume it seems to us that after the lapse of a

Digitized by Google

generation the need to which attention was called in 1875 is still as great as ever, and that no other existing periodical supplies it exactly in the same way as the *Church Quarterly* has endeavoured to do. There never was a time when religious questions were more keenly debated, and the enormous multiplication of journals of all kinds and shades of opinion during the past ten years has quickened popular interest in a manner and to an extent which might well have seemed incredible. This widening of the circle of interest has made the dissemination of sound knowledge all the more necessary. The remarkable results of improved methods of study in science and history have made a deep impression upon the minds of all thoughtful men, and it is not surprising that the right should be claimed to apply similar methods in other fields. The clergy, if they value that which is entrusted to them, cannot afford to be ignorant of what those who listen to them are reading and thinking about. The 'reconciliation' of religion and science has become to many minds a problem of the most serious perplexity, and the introduction of the methods of critical investigation in dealing with the historical portions of the Old and New Testaments with which people have become increasingly familiar since the publication of *Lux Mundi* has raised questions upon which accurate information and sound guidance are earnestly desired. Restatements of doctrine in the terms of modern ideas to meet the needs of modern life are said to be necessary, but it must be remembered that they must be based upon the results of sound learning informed with sober reverence and spiritual insight if they are really to satisfy. In Apologetic literature there is very much which needs to be done, and in Biblical study an effort must be made to distinguish between the true and the false, between what is established and what is merely hypothetical in the conclusions which are being gradually worked out in England and on the Continent. That something may be done in this way we have endeavoured to shew from the historical side by articles such as that on 'Criticism Rational and Irrational'(October 1902), the series upon the Synoptic

Digitized by Google

Problem and on the Fourth Gospel,[1] the studies on 'The Virgin Birth of Christ' (October 1904) and the 'Evidence for the Resurrection (January 1906), besides those in the last two numbers on 'The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles' (October 1906, January 1907), and in the present one on 'The Gospel History and its Transmission.' On the philosophical side we may refer to 'A New Way in Apologetic' (January 1905) and the three contributions on 'Liberal Theology,'[2] as well as to a very large number of Short Notices.

But it is not merely with regard to fundamental questions that discussion is rife. The necessity of adapting the administrative methods of the Church to the changed conditions of the times is becoming more and more urgent. Towns like Middlesborough have grown in a few years from a population which was numbered in hundreds to more than 100,000 inhabitants, and everywhere great cities are stretching out their arms to take in what were once sparsely populated country districts. The efforts of all the religious bodies together have failed to keep pace with the movement of the people. As was pointed out a year ago in dealing with the 'Training of Candidates for Holy Orders' (April 1906), there is a need not merely of more men but of men educated and trained with a greater regard for their future efficiency in their high calling. The Home Mission work of the Church such as was dealt with in relation to the 'Needs of South London' (April 1903), and of Liverpool and of Birmingham in other articles, has to some men little of the glamour of Foreign Missions, but both alike are indispensable, and neither can be properly carried on by agents scanty in number and inadequately equipped.

During the last five years alone we have tried to indicate the requirements of mission work in India, in Africa, Australia, Newfoundland, Japan and China in a series of contributions from men who have devoted their lives to the countries of which they write; and there are still many fields

[1] 'The Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels,' April 1903, Jan. and July 1904, Jan. 1905: 'The Fourth Gospel,' I.–III. April–Oct. 1905.

[2] Oct. 1905, Jan. and July 1906.

Digitized by Google

to be dealt with. The account of Missions to Hindus, of Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and the work of the Universities Mission and other Missions in Central Africa will be found to give some idea of the kind of problems which the missionaries have to solve and the religious beliefs of those among whom they work.[1] And as will be seen from those articles and from that on Lay Readers in the last number, special emphasis has been laid upon the opportunities both at home and abroad for the exercise of the priesthood of the laity, not as a mere figure of speech but as a living reality. There is need, and there is certainly ample room, for the energy and devotion of workers of all kinds; and at the same time there is certainly room for improved methods of organization and administration. The necessity for the increase of the diocesan episcopate was one of the first reforms which was urged by the *Church Quarterly* on its foundation, and we are thankful to have been able by refusing to allow the subject to sink into the background to do something to help in a movement whose importance is steadily impressing itself on the minds of Churchmen. It is true that some at least, whose opinions are entitled to be heard with the greatest respect, do not look with favour upon the proposals. It is urged that the result will be a lowering of the standard of those who are raised to the episcopate and a considerable increase of what is bluntly described as 'fuss.' We do not believe that either misgiving would be realized; and in any case it is surely too much to expect that the oversight of the dioceses of England to-day can be exercised efficiently by a body of men, however devoted, who are but little more numerous than they were in the reign of Henry VIII. If it were not for the self-sacrificing labours of the suffragan

[1] The following articles, among others, may be referred to:—'Missions to Hindus,' July–Oct. 1902, April 1903, Jan. 1905; 'Buddhist India,' July 1904; 'Mohammed and the Rise of Islam,' July 1906—a study to which we venture to call special attention; 'The Church in South Africa,' Oct. 1903; 'Missions in Nyasaland,' Jan.–April 1906; 'Notes on the Church in Australia,' Oct. 1903; 'The Church in Newfoundland,' July 1905; 'Japan and Western Ideas,' April 1904; 'The Real Yellow Peril,' Oct. 1906.

Digitized by Google

bishops the case would be even more glaring than it is; while on the other hand we must set the undeniable increase in spiritual activity and enthusiasm in the cities which have been given a chief Pastor whom they could really regard as their own Father-in-God.

It seems well worthy of consideration whether this policy would not do something also to remedy what is represented in some quarters as a state of anarchy alleged to exist among a large section of the clergy of the Church of England in matters of practice and discipline. We deal in the present number with the burning question of Ecclesiastical Courts and the reasons for which they fail to command obedience, but, as we pointed out last October in dealing with the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, there is no reason to believe that the number of really 'disloyal' clergy is other than very small. What is required is a method of exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction which Churchmen would recognize as valid, and that it should be humanly possible for the bishops to 'visit' their clergy that they may correct what is done amiss or omitted to be done and may encourage them in the work which they are doing their best to perform. Much harm has been caused in the past by attempts to solve difficult problems by rough-and-ready methods, and there is a real danger, as we have indicated, of ill-considered legislation which must prove alike disastrous in its immediate consequences and ineffectual to a permanent solution because, just as in the successive attempts at legislation on the Education question to which our pages have borne witness, it disregards the conscientious convictions of a considerable section of the people.

In dealing with Home Missions in England and with the work of the Church in distant lands we have not forgotten countries which are linked to us by alliance or friendship or by closer bonds of union. In the articles on the United Free Church of Scotland (October 1901) and on the Crisis caused by the result of the Appeals in 1903–4 (January 1905) we have attempted an estimate of the meaning of 'freedom' in this connexion. Nor have we been unmindful of the two

Digitized by Google

Churches in communion with our own in Scotland and in Ireland. The needs of the Church of Ireland and its methods of administration in its altered circumstances were fully described in an article eighteen months ago, and in two recent studies we have put forward what we believe to be the requirements both of justice and efficiency in relation to the burning question of the 'Reform of Trinity College, Dublin,' and the satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of Irish Roman Catholics for a University of their own worthy of the name.[1] On the Continent the religious situation in France has been made the subject of careful study and has been dealt with in a series of articles on the 'Catholic Reaction,' 'Religion and Politics' (July 1902), 'Christian Socialism in France' (April 1904), and one upon the early stages of the present crisis (April 1905), with which we deal further in this number. In the case of Germany we have studied—we trust, to some profit—her methods of education, secular and religious, in articles dealing with our own system, and her contributions to science and theology and history have been discussed in very many reviews. The study of the Religious Condition of Italy in October 1902, and of the life and character of the late Pope Leo XIII. (July 1903) by a very well known writer will be within the recollection of many of our readers.

Some indication has been given above of the way in which an attempt has been made to deal with the many questions which interest and the problems which confront the minds of Churchmen, both clergy and laity alike. The account might be largely extended, for we have made no mention of the valuable series of liturgical and doctrinal studies, such as Mr Darwell Stone's recently republished contributions on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, or the account in the two last numbers of the old Mozarabic Liturgy of the Church of Spain with the curious light which

[1] 'A Roman Catholic University for Ireland,' July 1901; 'The Three Churches in Ireland,' Oct. 1902; 'The Financial Position of the Church of Ireland,' July 1905; 'Irish University Education and the Reform of Trinity College, Dublin,' Oct. 1906; 'A University for Cork,' Jan. 1907.

Digitized by Google

it throws upon many points of interest. These articles are written by specialists, but they are not intended merely *for* specialists, and no pains have been spared—for example, in the last article containing the Mozarabic Mass in English—to smooth the path of the ordinary reader who may chance to take any interest at all in liturgical questions. It is the needs of the ordinary educated reader, whether cleric or layman, which have been kept in view throughout. It has been the constant aim of the *Church Quarterly* to do more than deal with exclusively theological and ecclesiastical subjects. In Philosophy and History, in Music and Art, in Literature and Science it has endeavoured to give a comprehensive survey of the movements of modern times. We should like to refer to the recent articles entitled 'A Philosophy of Phrases' (January 1904), 'The Oxford School of Historians' (October 1904), 'Creighton and Stubbs' (October 1905), 'Church Music' (January 1906), 'The Golden Age of Classic Christian Art: the Mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore' (October 1905), 'Recent Excavations in Crete' (January 1906), 'The Life of Sir E. Burne-Jones' (July 1905), 'Pre-Raphaelitism' (April 1906), 'Mr. Stanley Weyman's Novels' (January 1905), 'School Tales' (January 1906), 'Some Modern French Literature,' in the last number, and 'Weissmann and the Theory of Descent' (October 1905), as an example of what has been done in more lengthy studies; while in the Short Notices an effort has been made to supply reviews of many thousands of volumes in a manner which should convey real information without undue technicality, and be scholarly without being dull. That this aim has been achieved with some measure of success is shewn by the keen interest with which, as we have reason to know, our Short Notices—some of them, it must be admitted, of considerable length—are read by a very large number of our readers.

On the eve of a new departure it may not be amiss to take stock once more of the past. With the exception of our two great contemporaries the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*, no Review perhaps has ever been more fortunate in its contributors. As is well known, although the first

Digitized by Google

two numbers contained two signed articles,[1] the general policy of the *Church Quarterly* has been to preserve a strict anonymity, leaving to its contributors the responsibility of subsequently avowing their authorship if they so desire. This course has many advantages both theoretical and practical which will occur to everyone, and in the case of questions of policy it is both convenient and desirable that the utterance should be that of the *Church Quarterly Review* rather than of any individual contributor, however distinguished. But, apart from this, there are a number of historical, scientific and literary subjects, upon which, as will have been seen, we are accustomed to publish contributions, where the acknowledged reputation and learning of the writer, or the interest of his personality give to his words a claim to attention and consideration which they not infrequently fail to obtain in an anonymous article. We confess to have read, not without a certain grim appreciation, critiques of articles in our pages in which our anonymous contributor, more than once the greatest living authority on his subject, has been solemnly warned of the dangers of a smattering of knowledge. It is in recognition of this fact and in deference to the wishes of a large number of readers that it has been decided to admit within the limits indicated a certain number of *signed* articles in future. In any case it has been inevitable that the authorship would be disclosed in course of time by a writer or his representatives. As we pointed out in a former survey, it is now well known that the review in two articles (January 1877, January 1878) of Sir Theodore Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort* was by Mr. Gladstone; but it has not, we believe, hitherto been stated that he also wrote the first article which ever appeared in our pages—that on 'Italy and her Church.' Indeed the first ten numbers of the Review contained no fewer than four contributions from his pen, including besides those already mentioned the article on Dr. Norman Macleod. The same numbers contained also five articles

[1] 'The Present Position of the Irish Church,' Oct. 1875, by the Bishop of Derry (now Archbishop of Armagh); 'Dean Howson *Before the Table*,' Jan. 1876, by the Right Hon. A. J. B. Beresford Hope.

Digitized by Google

by Miss Charlotte Yonge, on 'Sunday-School and Lending-Library Literature,' 'Magazine Literature,' 'The World of Fiction,' 'Harriet Martineau' and 'Continental Culture,' while among her numerous later contributions may be mentioned the account of two Scottish Bishops (Bishops Jolly and Gleig) and the two very touching articles entitled 'The Spiritual Needs of Invalids' (October 1879), and 'Heroines of Charity' (July 1880). The article on the Public Worship Regulation Act, like those on the Ridsdale Judgement and on the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, and a number of others were by Mr. Beresford Hope. The important and delicate questions involved in the relationship of Church and State were dealt with in a number of contributions by Sir Robert Phillimore and other eminent legal authorities. Dean Church's authorship of the study of 'The Letters of Pope Gregory I' (April 1881), has already been disclosed, but he also wrote on 'Cassiodorus' (July 1880), and a large number of Short Notices. Dr. Liddon's estimate of the 'Recent Fortunes of the Church in Oxford' (April 1881) was generally identified from the significant omission of all mention of his name among the influences upon religious thought in Oxford which are there described. He also contributed an article on 'Egyptian Christianity' (January 1887), and numerous reviews of books. Among other writers now dead we may mention Dr. Eales, the late Bishop Lyttelton, Canon Meyrick, Canon Perry, Canon Venables, Canon Overton (whose contributions are well known), Dean Lake, Canon Aubrey Moore, Bishop Cotterill of Edinburgh, Judge O'Connor Morris and Canon Travers Smith. The last named was an unfailing friend to the Review from the first, and wrote many articles in it. Among yet others Dr. Littledale's articles on the Legal Basis of the Petrine Claims and kindred subjects are well known, and many of those by Dr. Bright have been republished in book form. Dr. Bright's contributions were very numerous and very varied in character, ranging—to take only four successive numbers at random—from 'The Ornaments Rubric and the Vestments' (October 1883), to 'English Hymnology' (April 1884), 'Christianity in

Digitized by Google

Egypt,' in the same number, and the study of 'A New Attack on the Athanasian Creed' (July 1884). It will surprise no one who is acquainted with the extraordinary facility of writing which he combined with vast learning to be told that on one occasion the Editor received from him within the space of twelve days three masterly articles upon three entirely different subjects, all composed in a few weeks. Among other individual contributions it is interesting to point further to one on 'Parochial Missions' (October 1876), by Mr. Walsham How, afterwards the dearly loved Bishop of East London, on the work of the London Lay Helpers' Association (July 1883), by Mr. George Spottiswoode, 'Retreats' (July 1879), by the late Dean Randall of Chichester, 'John Wyclif at Oxford' (October 1877), by the late Bishop Creighton, and a characteristic and noteworthy article 'How can Cathedrals best further the Culture of Church Music?' (January 1879), by Mr. (afterwards Sir) John Stainer.

We have perforce passed over many deeply interesting articles, for, as we ventured to point out in a former survey, the *Church Quarterly* has endeavoured to meet each important crisis which is of moment to Churchmen in a sober judicial spirit and with a well considered policy. Many of the most distinguished writers who have helped us by their counsel and their contributions are happily still living, and therefore may not be named here; but it has been the good fortune of the successive Editors to have numbered among contributors to articles and Short Notices alike very many of the highest authorities on ecclesiastical and historical and general subjects in the last generation, and, we will venture to add, in the present also.

In bringing this brief survey of our work to a conclusion we desire to urge upon our readers that if in lowering the price of the Review those who are responsible for it have taken a hazardous step they have done it in the belief that there are very many to whom its former price presented a serious obstacle in the way of becoming subscribers, and to ask therefore for the cordial support in the new venture of

Digitized by Google

all those who have at heart the objects which the *Church Quarterly Review* was founded to promote.

Since the above was written we have received many very kind replies to the circular with regard to the proposed change which was sent to our subscribers, and we desire to thank them for the pleasant manner in which with very few exceptions they have spoken of our work. They have recognized that even if in some points the advance in knowledge has entailed a change in the attitude of the Review, we have throughout remained loyal to those Catholic principles which it was founded to promote. As regards the changes proposed, it is not unnatural that the majority should approve a change which will make subscription to the Review easier, but it has been very gratifying to find that a very large number of those who have replied are willing to help us on our way by taking two numbers for a time—one for themselves and one for the benefit of some distant friend to whom we offered to send it. It may perhaps be permitted to add that in more than one case this promise of support would have been more effective had the sender not forgotten to give his name and address.

A word may be said with regard to the replies so far as they concern the character and contents of the Review. A certain number of subscribers fear the change lest we should be compelled by it to lower the standard of the *Church Quarterly* articles; a certain number ask us to remember that the clergy as a body would like something much more popular in character. We would answer both by saying that we do not intend to lower the standard. The price is being lowered because it is believed that the majority of those who wish to read the *Church Quarterly Review* will always be clergy (we say the majority, *not all*, for we have many most generous and sympathetic supporters among the laity), and that their incomes will not in these days allow them to pay the subscription which has hitherto been asked. We believe, and certainly the answers received justify the belief, that there is a large body of clergy and laity who are not afraid of our pages because we are some-

Digitized by Google

times rather academic, sometimes rather learned (we try not to be Dryasdusts), and because we attempt to discuss serious questions in a serious way.

Other advice which we have received is a little conflicting. Some would have us reduce the length of the articles, others would have us increase it. We intend to make no change. Some subscribers like signed articles, others do not. Shall we please both or neither by having some signed, some unsigned? We have given above the reasons which have led us to adopt the change which we are making in this respect: we will only add that we shall not necessarily hold ourselves responsible for everything which may be said in articles which are signed, while we shall admit on the other hand no article whose general tenour is inconsistent with the principles of the *Church Quarterly*.

Lastly there are a few subscribers who seemed to be inspired by the correspondence concerning the *Times* Book Club with the belief that there is 'villany somewhere' and that some unknown persons are reaping exorbitant profits. We can only reply that we have paid our printer's bills and a modest sum to our contributors, but that the large profits exist only in our subscribers' imaginations. Our new enterprise will require considerable capital which is to be contributed on a commercial basis: to be successful we must have at least 3,000 subscribers; if we are unsuccessful the Review must cease to exist. We believe, however, that the *Church Quarterly* has a part, and a valuable part, to play in the life of the Church of England, and that the reduced price will be a real gain to the clergy. May we appeal once more to our friends (and we have reason to know that we have good friends) to do all that they can to make our enterprise successful?

Digitized by Google

ART. I.—ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

1. *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. London. 1883.
2. *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of His Majesty. London. 1906. Printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office by Wyman & Sons, Limited, Fetter Lane, E.C.

IN the *Church Quarterly Review* for last October we considered at some length the findings of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.[1] It is, however, impossible to embrace the whole field of so extensive an inquiry in a single article, and so far as one, and that not the least important, part of the Recommendations was concerned we were obliged to be satisfied with pointing out that the Commissioners had justified the contention that the existing Ecclesiastical Courts both violated constitutional usage and failed to command much respect, and with quoting the Recommendations in which they suggested remedies for this condition of affairs.

The Royal Commission, it will be remembered, was instructed not only 'to inquire into the alleged prevalence of breaches or neglect of the Law relating to the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England and to the ornaments and fittings of churches,' but also 'to consider the existing powers and procedure applicable to such irregularities.' It will surprise no one who is acquainted with the history, of which the appointment and report of the Commission are the last stage, to learn that the consideration to which they were thus directed has led to the conclusion that 'the present structure of the ecclesiastical judicature, taken as a whole, is one chief cause of the growth of ritual irregularities in the Church of England.'[2] We propose to devote a few

[1] *Church Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1906, pp. 1–39.
[2] Report, p. 70, par. 381.

Digitized by Google

pages to a careful examination of this finding, and of the Recommendations which are based upon it.

It is, we believe, the truth that in the constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts is to be found the principal, if not the sole, explanation of a state of things of which explanation is certainly much needed. To be told that a very large number of the clergy of the Church of England systematically defy the law, would be, if it were not so familiar to our ears, exceedingly startling; and the statement becomes still more perplexing when it is added that the clergy are systematically abetted in this defiance by the bishops. To many indeed of the witnesses called before the Commission all this seems not only unquestionable in point of fact but perfectly simple and natural, in no way differing from the attitude towards the law of other criminal classes—coiners, burglars, and the like; as little needing explanation; and calling merely for the same unhesitating repression. We are not sure that down to a late stage of the inquiry the minds of one or two of the Commissioners were not much in the same condition. It would, we think, be mere waste of time to discuss the position of people who are content to look no deeper than this. No intelligent observer, whatever may be his religious opinions, can doubt that the continued prevalence, throughout a long period, of 'disorders' and 'lawlessness' among such a class of men as the bishops and clergy of the Church of England is a matter which cannot be thus summarily disposed of, and is indeed a symptom of some defect in our ecclesiastical system for which, if the Church is to be preserved in health, a remedy must sooner or later be found. If we turn to those witnesses who represent another school in the Church, we shall find that they put forward an explanation which, whether we agree with it or not, has at least the merit that it recognizes that there is something to be explained. They say that it is of the essential nature of a Church that she should herself declare and define her own law. They say that this not only has always been the doctrine of the Church of Christ, but also is the theory of the law and constitution of England. They say that, nevertheless, the law of the

Digitized by Google

Church is in fact—rather by a succession of oversights than by legislation framed on any deliberate policy—ultimately determined by a tribunal which represents not the Church but the State; that this tribunal, being established in violation of the fundamental principle already mentioned, is wholly without authority to determine the law; and that consequently its decisions are not binding *in foro conscientiae*. It is further added that the defective title of the court of ultimate appeal affects, at least in some degree, the courts which are subordinate to it and bound to follow its decisions. It follows that, the only existing Courts being illegitimate, there is no working machinery by which the law of the Church can be authoritatively declared.

Now whether we consider this position to be sound or not, the fact that it is held by a large section of the Church sufficiently accounts for the state of things which the Royal Commission was appointed to investigate. It is useless to tell a man to obey the law, when what you mean by the law is the decision of a Court whose authority to declare the law he holds himself bound on high grounds of principle and conscience to deny. It is evident that, if there be no duly authorized means of ascertaining the law, a man must in the last resort act upon his own view of what the law is; or perhaps we should say that, human nature being what it is, he will act upon his own view of what the law ought to be. That this is precisely the existing condition of the Church of England needs, we think, no proof. It is literally and truly a condition of anarchy, modified only by the personal influence of the bishops and the reluctance of the reasonable among the clergy to push matters to extremities.

We do not, of course, overlook the fact that means exist by which the law as declared by the present Courts can be actually enforced upon those who disobey it. Many of those who gave evidence before the Royal Commission appear to think that the only reform needed is to make this process easier and cheaper. But there is nothing in the machinery of the Courts (however much it may be susceptible of improvement) which accounts for the fact that as the result of fifteen or twenty years of litigation, during

Digitized by Google

which the whole force of the law was brought to bear, and, so far as technical result went, successfully brought to bear, upon the practices condemned by the final court, all those practices have steadily increased in use, and at the same time the policy of prosecution for ritual and ceremonial offences has been, by the almost universal consent of all parties, practically abandoned. The true reason is altogether different. We of this present age have no stomach for persecution, and a sufficiently determined body of really conscientious conviction upon any subject will render inoperative the most drastic legislation which Parliament can devise. Yet those who represented the attack before the Commission persisted throughout in attributing the practical failure of prosecutions for ritual offences to defects in the procedure (mostly imaginary, as they were very frequently reminded by Sir Lewis Dibdin, and as the Commissioners find[1]) and shut their eyes resolutely to the real cause, the impossibility of overriding by force, even with the most effective procedure in the world, the conscientious conviction of a body of men who, on these witnesses' own shewing, amount to something like half the clergy, and are supported by a considerable number of the most zealous among the laity. It appears to us plain that, whether the question is approached from the point of view of the churchman who believes that the Church is a Divine Society and not a department of the State, or from that of the practical statesman who aims merely at securing peace and efficiency, no solution of the problem is worth considering which does not recognize the position which we have attempted to describe. The churchman believes that in the main that position is sound; the statesman knows that as a practical matter it is impossible to ignore it.

It is necessary, before discussing the manner in which the Royal Commission has dealt with the problem as it stands to-day, to recapitulate shortly the history. Down to quite modern times the discipline of the clergy formed a very small part of the business of our Ecclesiastical Courts. The practitioner in those Courts, both before and since the

[1] Report, p. 68, par. 367.

Digitized by Google

Reformation, was far more concerned with such matters as are now dealt with by the Probate and Divorce Division of the High Court of Justice, with tithe and church rates, with the correction of the laity for immorality and irregularity, than with anything directly concerning the faith or worship of the Church. As to the Courts themselves, the Courts of the Archdeacon, of the Bishop, and of the Metropolitan, have been from time immemorial substantially what they are now; and there has always been the right of appeal in due gradation from the one to the other. Controversy begins when we come to consider what provision has been made for further appeal, and becomes acute upon the question whether and how such appeal ought to be given. There is no doubt that before the Reformation the normal course of ecclesiastical litigation included appeal to Rome. Whether or not such an appeal was permitted, and whether or not, if permitted, it was in practice used, in cases of doctrine or ritual, are points which cannot be said to be altogether settled. It is probably enough for the present purpose to say that such appeals were at least so rare that so eminent an authority as the late Bishop Stubbs was not satisfied of their existence. In his opinion: 'There is no evidence to shew that before the Reformation appeal was allowed in suits for correction on points of doctrine or ritual, and although there may be instances of prosecution for heresy being instituted on the demand of the Pope, there is no instance of appeal to the Pope on a charge of heresy being allowed by the provincial courts.'[1] The Commission of 1881 so far adopted the Bishop's conclusions as to declare that appeals to Rome 'gradually in fact became restricted to testamentary and matrimonial business.'[2] When in the days of Henry VIII. the Church and realm of England rejected the authority of the Pope, the question immediately presented itself whether any, and if so what, substitute should be introduced for the appellate jurisdiction which the Pope had exercised over the English Ecclesiastical

[1] Historical Appendix to *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts*, 1883, p. 51.

[2] Report (1883), p. xix.

Digitized by Google

Courts; and this involved the further question whether, if a new appellate tribunal were set up, it should entertain appeals in all cases, or in such only as had theretofore been taken to Rome. What Parliament in fact did was as follows. In 1533, by the Statute of Appeals (24 Hen. 8, c. 12), appeals to Rome in 'causes testamentary, causes of matrimony and divorces, rights of tithes, oblations and obventions' were forbidden, and such matters were thenceforth to be determined within the realm, the Archbishops' Courts being the final spiritual courts except in cases touching the Crown, in which a further appeal to the Upper House of Convocation was provided. In the following year (1534) the Statute of Submission of the Clergy (25 Hen. 8, c. 19) was passed, which prohibits all appeals to Rome, whether in the cases enumerated in the Statute of Appeals or otherwise, and applies the system of appeals provided by the statute for ordinary cases to all ecclesiastical cases whatsoever, including (as has been decided) those which touch the Crown. If the Act had stopped there, the Court of the Province would have been the final court, as it was under the Statute of Appeals in all cases within that Statute in which the Crown was not concerned. But the Statute of Submission added these momentous words, from which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as a court of ecclesiastical appeal deduces its title:

'And for lack of justice at or in any the courts of the archbishops of this realm . . . it shall be lawful to the parties grieved to appeal to the King's Majesty in the King's Court of Chancery, and that upon every such appeal a Commission shall be directed under the great seal to such persons as shall be named by the King's Highness his heirs or successors, like as in case of appeal from the Admiral Court, to hear and definitively determine such appeals and the causes concerning the same; which Commissioners so by the King's Highness his heirs or successors to be named or appointed shall have full power and authority to hear and definitively determine every such appeal with the causes and all circumstances concerning the same; and that such judgement and sentence as the said Commissioners shall make and decree in and upon any such appeal shall be good and

Digitized by Google

effectual and also definitive and no further appeal to be had or made from the said Commissioners for the same.'

The words of Bishop Stubbs as to this enactment are of importance:

'In the Statute 25 Hen. 8, c. 19 no express mention is made of appeals in questions of doctrine and ritual, so as to give a new right of appeal on such points where it had not before existed; as there was no custom of appealing on such points to the Pope, it is improbable that by this Act it was intended to allow an appeal on them to the King in Chancery, *i.e.* to the Court of Delegates; and as in the same session of Parliament an Act' [25 Hen. 8, c. 14, confirming 2 Hen. 5, st. 1 c. 7] 'was passed for the repression of heresy by other means, in which no provision for appeal of any kind is made, it is improbable that it was ever intended to apply the process before the High Court of Delegates to such questions.'

The tribunal constituted anew for the hearing of each appeal, as provided by the Statute of Submission, came to be known as the Court of Delegates, and was a final tribunal of ecclesiastical appeal down to 1832. During the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., the Court of High Commission absorbed practically all jurisdiction in cases really ecclesiastical. This probably explains the fact that when that Court was abolished it was assumed that appeal lay to the Delegates in all ecclesiastical cases, the distinction between the different classes of ecclesiastical business, for which different provision had been made by the legislation of Henry VIII., being forgotten.

The Court of Delegates was in some respects an unsatisfactory tribunal, and it was for very many years before it was abolished the subject of complaints. These complaints (which were considered by the Royal Commission of 1831 on Ecclesiastical Courts to be well founded) had relation to what formed the great bulk of the business which came before the Delegates—namely, matrimonial and testamentary cases—and had nothing to do with ecclesiastical cases in the sense in which the term is now used. The fact is that appeals really touching doctrine or worship are scarcely to

Digitized by Google

be found among the records of the Court of Delegates. As the result of a special report made at the instance of Lord Brougham by the Royal Commission in 1831, the jurisdiction of the Delegates was by the Act 2 & 3 Gul. 4, c. 92, transferred to the Privy Council, and became by an Act of the succeeding year (3 & 4 Gul. 4, c. 41) vested in the Judicial Committee of that body. It will be remembered that at the time at which these changes were effected the Convocations of the Church were not allowed to meet for business.

The objection taken by churchmen to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Privy Council has developed gradually, and the history of its development is sketched in the very interesting evidence of the Archbishop of Canterbury before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. The Archbishop establishes, we think, that in the first stage of the discussion the objections were confined to cases of doctrine; that when litigation on ritual and ceremonial began many of the 'High Church party' at first welcomed the Privy Council as a court of unbiassed lawyers whose decisions were to be preferred to those of the more prejudiced ecclesiastical judges; and that it was not until the judgements on vestments were pronounced that it became general to deny altogether for ecclesiastical cases of every description the appellate jurisdiction of the Privy Council. Human affairs are not governed by deductions accurately drawn from abstract propositions, and it is, we think, beyond question that in fact the growth of the belief (to the strength and prevalence of which the Archbishop emphatically testifies) that it is the duty of churchmen to refuse absolutely all obedience to the ecclesiastical decisions of the Privy Council, even in cases not directly involving doctrine, was immensely quickened when that tribunal decided, in apparent violation of every received principle of construction, that the 'Ornaments Rubric' prescribes the use, not of the ornaments which it mentions, but of such only of them as were ordered by another document, not referred to in the rubric, and issued about a century before. Had the decisions of the Privy Council upon the question of vestments been less hard to reconcile either with law or common

Digitized by Google

sense, certainly very much less would have been heard of the conscientious objection to its jurisdiction in ritual cases. It does not of course follow that the objection is unsound. As the Archbishop very candidly observes, 'it is based upon something deeper, further reaching, and more a matter of stern principle than any mere incident as to which way a decision has been recently given which might or might not affect those particular people.'[1] In other words, it does not follow, even if the examination into the title of the tribunal was originally caused by the character of its decisions, that the adverse conclusion upon that title is erroneous.

We think that the history, the main course of which we have briefly traced, establishes the position of those who affirm that the law of the Church of England is to-day in fact determined, so far as it is formally determined at all, by judges who represent not the Church but the State, set up by the State without consulting the Church, and neither possessing nor claiming to possess any spiritual or ecclesiastical authority. We know of no Christian body outside the Church of England which would be content to rely for the interpretation of its laws upon a tribunal so constituted. Its position is, we believe, wholly inconsistent with the tradition of the Universal Church, and with the theory of the English Constitution.

Two points occur here which were the subject of many questions and answers before the Royal Commission. It is said that the Privy Council do not determine the law of the Church, but merely interpret the instruments by which it is determined. Again, it is said that whatever force the objection to the Privy Council might have if it were confined to its jurisdiction in things spiritual, yet, when rights of property and other temporal matters are concerned, it is impossible to escape the control of secular law and secular courts.

With regard to the first of these points, it represents a position hardly tenable by anyone who knows anything of English legal procedure. Under a system such as ours, in

[1] *Minutes of Evidence*, vol. ii. p. 370.

Digitized by Google

which the decisions of the judges are of authority for the determination of other cases, the enactment of a statute is in reality but the first stage in the making of the law on the matter dealt with. The next stage is the interpretation by the Courts of the words used by the legislature, and the law consists, not of the bare statute but of the statute with the glosses put upon it by the judges. The older the statute the more copious is, as a rule, the authoritative commentary, and moreover the older statutes, and such documents as the rubrics of the Prayer Book, are not usually expressed with the precision at which modern draftsmen at least aim; are thus in more need of interpretation, and leave to the office of the interpreter greater freedom and therefore greater power. In other words, a tribunal duly authorized to interpret such documents as the formularies of the Church is in fact not merely the expounder, but in great degree the maker, of the Church's law. Moreover its power is the greater because its decisions are practically exempt from correction by fresh legislation.

But in truth it is unnecessary to labour the contention that such a tribunal as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council must inevitably (so far as it has authority at all) determine the law of the Church. We have an express declaration by the tribunal itself that this is its function. In the year 1882 the appeal of *Merriman* v. *Williams*[1] was heard and determined by the Privy Council. The appeal arose in a suit brought by the Bishop of Grahamstown in the secular courts of the Cape Colony in order, among other objects, to restrain Dr. Williams, who was dean and rector of the cathedral church of St. George, Grahamstown, from officiating in that church. The ground of the suit was (in substance) that Dr. Williams, being a member of the Church of the Province of South Africa and subject to its discipline, had been suspended from his office by a sentence of the Diocesan Court duly pronounced. The church in question was held in trust exclusively 'for ecclesiastical purposes in connexion with the Church of England' as by law established; and the defence set up by

[1] *Law Reports*, App. Cas. vol. vii. p. 484.

Digitized by Google

Dr. Williams was that it, and he as its minister, were not subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop or to the discipline of the Church of South Africa. So far as Dr. Williams' personal position was concerned, both the Supreme Court of the Colony and the Privy Council decided against him, holding clearly that he had submitted himself to, and was bound by, the laws of the Church of South Africa. Accordingly before the Privy Council the case was narrowed to the single issue, whether or not under the trusts upon which the building in question was held—namely for ecclesiastical purposes in connexion with the Church of England—it was a part of the property, and subject to the laws, of the Church of South Africa. In the words of the Judgement (p. 507), 'What the charters of the endowment now in question require is connexion with the Church of England as by law established; and on this part of the case it is sufficient for the plaintiff if he can show such a connexion on the part of the Church of South Africa.' Now the written constitution of the Church of South Africa affirmed 'in the strongest way the connexion of the Church of South Africa with the Church of England, and its adherence to the faith and doctrine of the Church of England' (p. 509); but it contained a proviso which was, in the opinion of the Privy Council, fatal to the contention that the two Churches were 'connected':

'Provided also that in the interpretation of the aforesaid standards and formularies' [of the Church of England] 'the Church of this province be not held to be bound by decisions in questions of faith and doctrine, or in questions of discipline relating to faith and doctrine, other than those of its own ecclesiastical tribunals, or of such other tribunal as may be accepted by the Provincial Synod as a tribunal of appeal.'

The effect of this was, in the judgement of the Privy Council, substantially to exclude 'portions of the faith and doctrine of the Church of England' (p. 509) In order to make good this position, it was necessary for the Lords of the Council to decide where and how that faith and doctrine are to be discovered, and their conclusion is expressed in the

Digitized by Google

Judgement (delivered by the late Lord Hobhouse) with singular force and clearness:

The standards of faith and doctrine adopted by the Church of England 'are not to be found only in the texts. They are to be found also in the interpretation which those texts have from time to time received at the hands of the tribunals by law appointed to declare and administer the law of the Church' (p. 509): 'The decisions referred to' (that is, the decisions of the Privy Council in the Gorham case and in the *Essays and Reviews* cases) 'form part of the constitution of the Church of England as by law established, and the Church and the tribunals which administer its laws are bound by them. That is not the case as regards the Church of South Africa. The decisions are no part of the constitution of that Church, but are expressly excluded from it. There is not the identity in standards of faith and doctrine which appears to their lordships necessary to establish the connexion required by the trusts on which the church of St. George is settled. There are different standards on important points. In England the standard is the formularies of the Church as judicially interpreted. In South Africa it is the formularies as they may be construed without the interpretation' (pp. 510–511).

We have thought it right to devote some space to an examination of this important decision, because it establishes conclusively that the Privy Council does in fact claim binding authority to determine not merely the ritual but also the faith, of the Church: an authority which in truth follows necessarily from its jurisdiction, if conceded, as the final tribunal of ecclesiastical appeal. We cannot, we confess, understand the position of anyone who believes that the Church is in any sense a spiritual society and at the same time regards such a jurisdiction as tolerable. We are glad to think that the Royal Commission do not defend it.

We pass now to the second point mentioned above: namely, that inasmuch as litigation in the Ecclesiastical Courts often, if not always, involves property, it is necessary to have an appeal from those courts to a secular tribunal. This point recurs perpetually throughout the proceedings of the Royal Commission, and we have been surprised to notice the confusion which appears to have beset the

Digitized by Google

minds not only of many witnesses but also of some of the Commissioners, with regard to it. In one sense the proposition is a truism. Nothing which affects the person or property of any subject is exempt from review by the King's courts. But there is no inconsistency with this in the finality of decisions of Ecclesiastical Courts, or of any other special tribunals, as to matters within their jurisdiction and duly determined by them. The most striking difference as to this between the courts of the 'established' Church of England and similar tribunals of 'voluntary' religious bodies is that the jurisdiction of the latter must be proved, as must the jurisdiction of arbitrators, commissioners, and other special secular tribunals, by shewing either agreement to be bound by their decisions or specific authority conferred on them by Parliament, whereas, on the other hand, the courts of the Church of England are of immemorial authority recognized by the Common Law. We ought perhaps to notice another distinction, the importance of which has become almost wholly theoretical: namely, that whereas the courts of the Church have jurisdiction in theory over all persons within the realm, the tribunals of other religious bodies have no power except over persons who in some way or other have been brought expressly under their authority. The fact that the coercive jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts is now practically confined to the clergy prevents this distinction from being of actual importance. But the principle upon which the decisions of the Ecclesiastical Courts are enforced by the State through the ordinary courts of law is exactly the same as that upon which are enforced those of the voluntary tribunals of Nonconformist bodies, or those of arbitrators and other similar tribunals, whether agreed upon by the parties concerned or imposed upon them by statute: namely, that within their powers they are supreme, and the King's court, if appealed to, has merely to inquire whether the matter decided on was within their jurisdiction, and whether the jurisdiction was regularly exercised. We will illustrate our meaning. Under the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act 1871, upon the vacancy of a benefice the amount payable in respect

Digitized by Google

of dilapidations by the outgoing incumbent or his representatives to the new incumbent is fixed absolutely, upon the surveyor's report (subject to the observance of certain forms and stages), by the bishop, without any possibility of appeal; and the sum so fixed is a debt due to the new incumbent and recoverable in an ordinary Common Law action. Let us suppose that the outgoing incumbent neglects to pay, and that his successor sues him at Common Law for the amount. The court could not entertain any suggestion that the valuation was incorrect, or that the bishop had made a mistake; it would merely require proof that the surveyor's report had been duly made, that the forms required by the statute had been observed, and that the bishop had made the order. On being satisfied of these facts, the court would be bound to give judgement for the amount claimed. This example shews clearly enough the confusion which we have mentioned as to the necessity of control by the King's courts. In our instance the control exists and is exercised, in the sense that the court sees that the special tribunal (in this case the bishop) has proceeded regularly in a matter within its authority; but there the control stops, and on the substance of the question, namely whether the order correctly represents what ought to be paid by one party to the other, the bishop is absolute master, and the court has nothing to say. It is obvious that the general principle of control by the King's courts over all transactions affecting person or property does not involve a right of appeal on merits.

Let us come a little nearer controversy. Witnesses before the Royal Commission who advocated what may be called a self-contained system of Ecclesiastical Courts, subject to no appeal to a secular tribunal, were repeatedly confounded by the suggestion that such an appeal is necessary because the sentences of Ecclesiastical Courts comprise suspension and deprivation, and thus touch property. As we have said, we are surprised that this line of cross-examination was so successful as it seems to have been; and the more because the very state of things which it is suggested is impossible, exists without inconvenience in Scot-

Digitized by Google

land, to say nothing of foreign countries. Let us see how it would work. Suppose a rector deprived by the sentence of the supreme ecclesiastical court, whatever it may be, for heresy. The vacancy is duly notified to the patron: he presents to the living, and his presentee is duly instituted and inducted; but the deprived rector refuses to leave the parsonage. Thereupon the new rector brings an action in the ordinary Common Law court to recover possession of the house. The court will require proof of the sentence of the ecclesiastical court and of the plaintiff's title as rector, and, these facts having been established, will give a judgement which will enable the sheriff to eject the deprived rector with whatever force may be necessary. No argument would be admissible as to whether the ecclesiastical court had decided rightly that the defendant was heretical, that being a matter exclusively for the ecclesiastical court and wholly outside the competence of the Common Law court. We have said that this system prevails in Scotland, and it is true that it does govern the relation of the Established Church of Scotland to the Court of Session. But it also prevails in England. Here, as in Scotland, the ordinary courts of law recognize fully the exclusive right of the Ecclesiastical Courts, proceeding regularly, to adjudicate upon matters within their jurisdiction. The difference is that in England the expression 'Ecclesiastical Courts' includes what is now admitted to be a secular court, representing not the Church but the State—namely, the Privy Council—whereas in Scotland the Ecclesiastical Courts are really ecclesiastical.

Both the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, appointed in 1881, and the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, recommend considerable changes in the ecclesiastical judicature, the more recent Commission having adopted, with one important modification, the conclusions of their predecessors on the subject. Both Commissions have been convinced that the maintenance of the existing system of courts as a working system is impossible. In the words of the Commission on Discipline:

'A Court dealing with matters of conscience and religion must,

Digitized by Google

above all others, rest on moral authority if its judgments are to be effective. As thousands of the clergy, with strong lay support, refuse to recognise the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee, its judgments cannot practically be enforced.' [1]

We imagine that we are not wrong in concluding further that both Commissions, and more especially the later of the two, have considered that there is (to say the least) reason for the objections which have been taken to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Privy Council. It is, we think, much to have got so far, and we hope that such gross ignorance of the elementary conditions of the problem as was shewn even by so distinguished a witness as the present Attorney-General will become rarer in the future. If a solution is ever found, it will not be by legislation which disregards history and ignores the spiritual character of the Church.

We have said that the Report of 1883 and that of last year agree in the main in their proposals for the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts. These partly concern the Diocesan and Provincial Courts, all of which, in the judgement of the Commissioners, need to be strengthened. The alterations recommended are designed to secure the personal presence of the bishop and the metropolitan in their own Courts, and also the assistance of expert assessors. So far as we know, there is little difference of opinion either as to the expediency of reform, or as to the wisdom generally of these proposals. We pass to the far more controversial question of the final Court of Appeal. As to this the Commission of 1881 recommended as follows:

'An appeal shall lie from the Court of the Archbishop to the Crown, and the Crown shall appoint a permanent body of lay judges learned in the law, to whom such appeals shall be referred. Every person so appointed shall, before entering on his office, sign the following declaration: I do hereby solemnly declare that I am a member of the Church of England as by law established.

'The number summoned for each case shall not be less than five, who shall be summoned by the Lord Chancellor in rotation.

[1] Report, p. 67, par. 363.

Digitized by Google

'The judges shall have the power of consulting the archbishop and bishops of the province, or, if thought advisable, of both provinces, in exactly the same form as the House of Lords now consults the judges of the land upon specific questions put to them for their opinion; and

'Shall be bound so to consult them on the demand of any one or more of their number present at the hearing of the appeal.

'The judges shall not be bound to state reasons for their decisions, but if they do so, each judge shall deliver his judgement separately . . . and

'The actual decree shall be alone of binding authority; the reasoning of the written or oral judgement shall always be allowed to be reconsidered and disputed.'[1]

As we have said, the Commission on Discipline adopt these recommendations with one important modification. For the words of the earlier Report which would empower the judges of the final court to consult the bishops, they substitute the following:

'Where, in an appeal before the Final Court which involves charges of heresy or breach of ritual, any question touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England shall be in controversy, which question is not in the opinion of the Court governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament, and involves the doctrine or use of the Church of England proper to be applied to the facts found by the Court, such question shall be referred to an assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, who shall be entitled to call in such advice as they may think fit; and the opinion of the majority of such assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops with regard to any question so submitted to them shall be binding on the Court for the purposes of the said appeal.'[2]

Before we offer any criticism on these recommendations, it is important to see exactly what they mean. The appeal to the Crown from the Ecclesiastical Courts is retained; it is an appeal in the ordinary sense: that is to say, the appellate court has power not merely to set aside the judgement of the lower court but (in substance) to determine the cause finally itself. The sole limit on its power

[1] Report, p. lvii. [2] Report, p. 77.

Digitized by Google

is that on certain questions (but not all) which touch the doctrine or use of the Church, the court must consult the archbishop and bishops, and is bound by their opinion. We have said that it is only certain questions of doctrine and worship which are to be so referred, and consideration of those which are excepted will shew that the function intended to be reserved to the spiritualty is very strictly limited. The synod (so to call it) is to have no voice if the question is '*in the opinion of the Court* governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament.' Reflecting that these words would include not only all the Acts of Uniformity but also the whole of the Prayer Book, and perhaps the Articles of Religion, we see that the power of the bishops, although introduced by the Commissioners with considerable parade, would scarcely exist as to ritual, and even as to doctrine would be narrowly circumscribed. On the other hand, it has been objected against this recommendation of the Commissioners, by those who view with jealousy anything which may tend to make the Church less comprehensive, that the form in which the Commissioners would commit to the bishops judgement on matters of doctrine, by requiring of them an abstract statement to be rigidly applied by the court, is far more dangerous to liberty of thought than a power to adjudicate directly upon the suit. We think that this criticism is well founded.

In order to understand the reasons for what is proposed it is necessary to see upon what principles the Commissioners base it. They say at p. 64 (par. 356) of their Report that the result of modern study of the nature and history of Ecclesiastical Courts has been

'a clearer perception of the functions which are appropriate to a Court exercising the Royal supremacy in ecclesiastical causes, whether it be the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council or any other tribunal.' 'It is recognised,' they add, 'that the authority exercised by this Court is that of the Crown and not that of the Church. Without being itself a Church Court, and without pretending to possess spiritual jurisdiction, it has the duty of revising, where necessary, judgments given in Church Courts

Digitized by Google

possessing spiritual jurisdiction. To quote the Report of the Eccelesiastical Courts Commission (1883): "Every subject of the Crown who feels aggrieved by a decision of any [spiritual Court] has an indefeasible right to approach the Throne itself with a representation that justice has not been done him, and with a claim for the full investigation of his cause." '

And they assume, as the consequence of the proposition thus quoted, that 'there must be an appeal to the Crown from the Church Courts.' We are confident that if the word 'appeal' is used here as meaning such an appeal as lies to the Privy Council at present, this is a *non sequitur*. What is this 'indefeasible right to approach the Throne itself' which is said to involve the necessity of an appeal from Ecclesiastical Courts to a secular court and the determination by a secular court of ecclesiastical causes? It is an imposing phrase. We have a vision of suppliant subjects kneeling before the monarch throned and crowned; and it is a little chilling to reflect that what is really meant by 'the Throne itself' is half a dozen lawyers sitting at a table and being 'approached' with a legal argument going to shew that on some doubtful point another lawyer has formed an erroneous opinion. We entertain, moreover, a good deal of suspicion as to an 'indefeasible right' of which the origin is a few words of a statute of Henry VIII., and without which our neighbours of the Established Church of Scotland contrive to get on perfectly well. The real truth is, we make bold to say, that this 'indefeasible right' (which is merely the familiar supremacy of the Crown over all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil) has nothing whatever to do with an appeal in the sense in which the Commissioners use the word. It does not mean that causes ecclesiastical and spiritual are to be determined by secular judges instead of, as Lord Coke says they are to be, by ecclesiastical judges. It means that the subject has a right to apply to secular judges, as representing the Crown, to keep the Ecclesiastical Courts from straying beyond their borders, to see that they do not do injustice, and to see that any of their judgements which the secular power is called upon to enforce has been regularly pronounced. This indeed is a conception

Digitized by Google

with which the lawyers and statesmen of Tudor times would be thoroughly familiar: we have already referred to the considerations which led Bishop Stubbs to believe that they never contemplated anything so foreign to the spirit of that age as an appeal (in the modern sense) to a secular court in causes really ecclesiastical.

We believe, therefore, ourselves that there is no constitutional principle which makes any such appeal necessary, and that it would be simpler and better to get rid of it altogether than by restrictions and qualifications to endeavour to avoid the difficulties which it involves. The abolition of the appeal would leave unimpaired the control which the High Court of Justice exercises over ecclesiastical courts by the ancient writs of mandamus and prohibition. The writs are ancient, but the control is living and effective. Not only can the Ecclesiastical Courts be thus compelled to do justice, and to keep within their jurisdiction, but they are also corrected if they misconstrue any Act of Parliament, even one which deals solely with ecclesiastical matters. We observe that Sir Lewis Dibdin in his evidence [1] belittles the writ of prohibition, and in particular that he omits to notice the important point just mentioned as to the interpretation of Acts of Parliament; we have failed, moreover, to find that he mentions mandamus at all, although by that writ Ecclesiastical Courts can be compelled to do their duty, just as by prohibition they can be prevented from exceeding it. Sir Lewis throughout the inquiry cross-examined the witnesses with very remarkable knowledge and acumen, and although other eminent lawyers served on the Commission, they were not able to give the same time and attention to its proceedings, nor were they perhaps so well equipped for the purpose. The result was that, as Sir Lewis unfortunately could not cross-examine himself, his own evidence on matters of legal learning passed in great measure unchallenged.

Assuming that some appeal beyond the Provincial Courts is thought necessary, our conclusion, if we had power to do what we thought absolutely best, would be to provide

[1] *E.g.* vol. 3, p. 403.

Digitized by Google

a final court truly ecclesiastical, composed of bishops representing the whole episcopate of the English provinces, assisted, as might be found necessary, by legal, theological, and liturgical experts as assessors. We believe that such a court would be an admirable one in actual working; we should be perfectly content to leave it without any control other than that which the State exercises, always has exercised, and always must exercise, by means of the ordinary courts of law; and we can see no need whatever for any further appeal. We may observe that the only tangible ground suggested by the Commissioners for a special appeal from Ecclesiastical Courts—namely, that ecclesiastical judges are appointed by bishops and not by the Crown—fails here, inasmuch as the bishops, who would compose the final court, are appointed by the Crown.

It is, however, most important to conciliate opposition, so far as it can be done without infringing the principles which must be regarded in any settlement which is to be final; and there is undoubtedly a strong prejudice for the control of Ecclesiastical Courts by a secular tribunal other than the ordinary courts of law. If this sentiment can be satisfied without violating principle, we think that it would be wise to satisfy it. Now, we take it that the fundamental and undisputed principles governing this matter are: first, that the Church judges ecclesiastical causes by the bishops or their delegates; and, second, that the State has a right to see that injustice is not done, nor justice denied, by the ecclesiastical judges to any of its subjects. We believe, as we have said, that the State can secure this latter object by means of its ordinary tribunals, but there is clearly no objection of principle to the erection of a special court for the purpose. What we believe to be essential is that such a court should not usurp the function of the Church courts—should not, that is, itself determine ecclesiastical causes, but should confine itself to correcting miscarriages on the part of the Ecclesiastical Courts. It is important to recall the language by which the Statute of Submission gave the appeal to the Delegates, and to contrast it with that in which appeal is permitted by the

Digitized by Google

Statute of Appeals from one Ecclesiastical Court to another. The Statute of Appeals (which is referred to and adopted by the Statute of Submission) allows the subject to 'take, have, and use his appeal' to the bishop, &c., 'if in case any of the parties be grieved.' In the Statute of Submission the words are 'for lack of justice at or in any the courts of the archbishops.' This language bears a strong likeness to, and was probably taken from, the well-known passage in the Constitutions of Clarendon: 'De appellationibus si emerserint ab archidiacono debent procedere ad episcopum, ab episcopo ad archiepiscopum. Et si archiepiscopus *defecerit in iustitia exhibenda*, ad dominum regem perveniendum est postremo.' Here, again, we may note the difference between the language as to appeal from one Ecclesiastical Court to another, and that as to the final appeal to the king. It seems reasonable to conclude that the difference is significant, and that what is meant by an appeal 'for lack of justice' is not that the appellate Court is to examine the whole cause afresh, and to reverse the judgement of the court below merely because it does not agree with it, but that it is to correct anything which may fairly be called injustice. If, for example, the Ecclesiastical Court has admitted considerations wholly irrelevant or illegitimate, or has excluded or overlooked considerations plainly material, or if its judgement is in any other respect palpably mistaken or perverse, there would be a case for the intervention of the appellate court 'for lack of justice.' But it is, as we have said, essential, if the principle that the Church is the judge of her own law is to be maintained in truth and not merely in form, that the powers of the secular court of appeal should only be to remit for re-hearing, and that it should not itself determine the cause, or merely remit it *pro forma* with a binding direction as to the judgement to be entered. We remind our readers of the words of that great ecclesiastical lawyer and judge, Sir Robert Phillimore, in his reservation appended to the Report of 1883:

'I am unable to concur in those recommendations of the Report which suggest that there should be an appeal to the

Digitized by Google

Crown: in other words, that lay judges should decide causes in the last resort, the practical effect of which would be to enable these lay judges to dictate to the archbishop spiritual sentences which he would have, perhaps contrary to his own judgement, to pronounce.' [1]

We are convinced that the final appeal recommended by the Commissioners would be open to the same objections on grounds of principle as that which is now authorized. If so, it would be far better to leave the whole thing alone than to legislate so. There are two grounds, and two only, which justify an alteration of the existing law in the direction recommended by the Commission: either that it is an unconstitutional infringement of the Church's right, or that it is thought by so many to be so that in practice it cannot be worked. If neither of these reasons be admitted, there is no ground for any change, and the law as it exists should be rigorously enforced. But it is worse than useless to devise a reform which is justifiable only on the assumption that it is right or necessary to satisfy certain convictions, if, after all, it does not satisfy them.

The appeal which we have suggested from the final Ecclesiastical Court, whether it be the Provincial Court or a Court representing both provinces, to a secular court of appeal, would be of the kind which is known in France as the *appel comme d'abus*, and is in use also in various forms in other countries. The essence of it is that it is a complaint to the secular power of abuse or injustice, and that, if it be made good, the result is that the cause is reheard before an Ecclesiastical Court, the cardinal principle that secular courts have no jurisdiction to decide ecclesiastical causes being preserved. We notice that Mr. Justice Phillimore, in his evidence before the Royal Commission (Q. 3583), gives it as his opinion that by the expression 'for lack of justice' in the Statute of Submission an appeal of this kind was intended. We find it difficult to reconcile this opinion with that part of the statute which empowers the Delegates 'to hear and definitively determine such

[1] Report, p. lxiii. We apprehend that in this passage by 'lay judges' are meant judges appointed by the Crown.

Digitized by Google

appeals and the causes concerning the same.' But, however this may be, it is satisfactory to find a precedent for the scheme of judicature which we have advocated, and to find it in a country which affords, in Dean Church's words, 'a remarkable example of a national Church, aiming at a constitutional position as a Divinely founded religious society, with its own usages and liberties, in harmony with . . . the claims of a singularly strong and jealous civil government.' [1]

It will have been noticed that the recommendations of the Commission of 1881 as to the final court include one that 'the judges shall not be bound to state reasons for their decision.' The Commission on Discipline also appears to attach importance to this point, and it seems to be thought that if judgement were given without reasons by the secular court of appeal (which was the practice of the Court of Delegates), the objections to the decision by such a court of ecclesiastical causes would disappear or be much diminished. We think it quite likely that if originally the Privy Council had imitated the Delegates in this respect, a good deal of agitation might have been avoided; but that a return to the practice now would be attended by any considerable advantages we believe to be a delusion. This is another of the points upon which the Commissioners appear to have accepted without much inquiry what Sir Lewis Dibdin told them. We observe that he went so far as to say (Q. 16264) that if reasons were not given 'there never could be any Privy Council judgements which would be precedents'; and to this he obtained the assent of so learned a person as Mr. Chadwyck-Healey. We can only say that it is simply not the fact that judgements of which the reasons are not reported are not treated as authorities in our Courts. Many instances will occur to every lawyer: we may mention the decisions of the House of Lords reported in the older reports; certificates by the Common Law courts upon cases submitted to them by the Court of Chancery; some decisions of the Court for Crown

[1] *Report of Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts*, 1883, Hist. App. vii. p. 170.

Digitized by Google

Cases Reserved; and of the judges on Crown cases before that Court was established. But a moment's consideration will shew that it must be so. Suppose, for instance, a proceeding against a clergyman for wearing a chasuble: the Ecclesiastical Court decides in his favour; the Privy Council, on appeal, reverse the decision. It is obviously a necessary element in the decision of the Privy Council that a chasuble is an unlawful vestment, and equally obvious that the decision would be relied on as an authority to that effect. Indeed, the words of the Commission of 1881, 'the actual decree shall be alone of binding authority,' admit as much.

There are many other points of great interest in connexion with Ecclesiastical Courts which are suggested by the Report and evidence under consideration; but we can only deal, in conclusion, with two questions of what may be called practical politics..

It is usually objected, when opinions such as we have been contending for are put forward, that they involve a complete capitulation to the 'High Church party,' and that no corresponding concession is offered to other sections of the Church. We find, for instance, that this was put by some of the Commissioners to Lord Hugh Cecil. The best answer will be found, we think, in the words of the Report (p. 67, par. 363):

> 'Those who most desire to repress irregularities are those who have most to gain by the substitution of an effective tribunal for a Court which, because it is powerless, encourages rather than represses disorder. The establishment of a Court, the authority of which could not be disputed, would destroy any foundation for the claim now in fact made by a section of the clergy to decide for themselves the limits of canonical obedience.'

This is, to anyone who will look at the facts, the most manifest truth. The case of such bodies as the Church Association is that law-breaking is widespread on the 'High Church' side. It is strange that it does not occur to them that it is breakers of the law who profit by the anarchy which results from attempting to work an impossible system. Again, the small extremist minority are pro-

Digitized by Google

tected against discipline, as things now are, by the support of an immensely larger body of churchmen, who, though they have little sympathy either with their teaching or their practice, are resolved to resist, even at the cost of the toleration of things which ought not to be tolerated, the exercise of a jurisdiction which they believe to be a violation of the fundamental liberties of the Church. For the attack the elementary tactics are to dissolve this alliance, and it is nothing else than folly for the 'Low Church party' to insist on retaining Courts which experience has shewn to be practically useless, because they are afraid of making concessions to 'High Church' principles. It is no doubt sometimes hinted, rather than stated, that this 'Low Church party' have, on their side, principles as to Church courts against which even such proposals as those of the Royal Commission would offend. We cannot think that this position can be seriously maintained. Indeed, we find it difficult to believe that there is, among churchmen of any school who have given thought to the matter, any considerable number who would deliberately defend the jurisdiction of a secular court to determine ecclesiastical causes. But whether this be so or not, it is at least incredible that any churchman could have a 'conscientious objection' to a court composed of bishops or their delegates. He might, of course, think it a court injudiciously constituted; but that is quite another matter. It seems to us, therefore, as to the Commission, that the 'Low Church party' have everything to gain, and nothing to lose, by the substitution of a correct procedure for one which, because it is incorrect, cannot be worked.

The other question is, we think, a more serious one, and it naturally and rightly troubled the minds of the Commissioners. When they were told that it was necessary to alter this and that in order to meet scruples by which the clergy were prevented from obeying existing authority, the question naturally occurred: What security have you that if what you suggest is done, obedience will follow? There is no doubt, we think, that this attitude of suspicion is not without justification. We are obliged

Digitized by Google

to say, further, that the way in which some of the witnesses gave their evidence was not likely to reassure the Commissioners. Nevertheless, the evidence, as a whole, confirms us in the clear conviction that if a genuine system of Ecclesiastical Courts were established, resting throughout upon the spiritual authority of the bishops, and subject only to such control by the secular power as is described above, and as has always been recognized by the Church as admissible, disobedience on the 'High Church' side would cease. We do not mean, of course, that all the decisions of such tribunals would necessarily be accepted, because it is conceivable that they might disallow doctrines or practices which some might regard as essential parts of the tradition of the Catholic Church; but the consequence would be that a person holding such opinions would, if condemned, feel himself constrained to cease to minister in a Church which had, in his view, abandoned the truth: he could not, as he does now, simply disregard the judgement of the court on the ground that it is the utterance not of the Church of which he is a priest but of the State, to which in such matters he owes no obedience.

We should like to add that we do not dissent from that which we understand to be the opinion of the Royal Commission, that it might be dangerous to set up an efficient system of Church courts without at the same time making more elastic the existing law of ritual and ceremonial.

Art. II.—NEW COLLEGE AND KING'S: A STUDY IN REFORM.

1. *Augustus Austen Leigh, Provost of King's College, Cambridge.* A Record of College Reform. By William Austen Leigh, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. (London: Smith, Elder & Co, 1906.)
2. *New College*, 1856–1906. By Hereford B. George, M.A., Senior Fellow. (London: Henry Frowde, 1906.)

The present age has been lately described as an age of retrospect and stocktaking; and certainly the two books

Digitized by Google

at the head of this article seem to correspond with the general character thus assigned to the times. Roughly speaking, we may describe the years from 1830 to 1890 as a period of achievement—achievement which received its original impulse from the passing of the Reform Act of 1832. Since 1890, though useful reforms have been effected, we have been, perhaps, more engaged in reviewing, systematizing, and taking stock of the past than in entering on new and far-reaching enterprises. It looks as if with the advent to power of a vast and sweeping Liberal majority, such as was not equalled even in the days immediately succeeding the Reform Bill, we were to enter on a fresh stage of legislation and social reformation, or even revolution, the direction of which it is not easy to predict, but the general tendency of which is certain to be an attempt to secure for the working masses a larger share of those privileges and advantages which the reforms of the Victorian epoch mainly threw open to the middle classes.

Meanwhile, as we have said at the outset, the country has been busy in taking stock of what has been already accomplished, and in trying to realize what the gain and loss brought by the last sixty years have been. It is with one particular small field, within a much larger area at each of our old Universities, that the two books before us deal, shewing how in each case an ancient and important foundation has been so altered and transformed as to increase the utility of both, and to adapt them, as far as possible, to meet new needs and the requirements of an expanding and progressive age. We have spoken as if both books treated of the same subject—viz. the reforms effected in the great sister foundations of King's and New College: and so in substance they do; for though the first of the two works is in name a biography, and gives us some charming side glimpses into the life of the period, yet the kernel of the book and the main claim which justifies its publication lies in the story of the reforms effected by the subject of the biography and his contemporaries in the great foundation with which, first as Scholar, then as Tutor

Digitized by Google

and Dean, and finally as Provost, he was so long and so intimately associated.

The twin foundations of Eton and King's, owing their origin to the munificence of the unfortunate King Henry VI., had been confessedly modelled after the pattern of the two St. Mary Winton Colleges (New College and Winchester), founded some fifty years earlier by William of Wykeham. Indeed, the connexion between the two foundations had been even more intimate than this; for Henry, acting on the advice of Bishop Beckington, had imported his first Master, William of Waynflete, and his original Scholars direct from Winchester, so that Eton must be regarded as a veritable offshoot of the older school. In an interesting document, originally drawn up in 1444 and recently republished (its republication being celebrated by a gathering representative of the four colleges), the four foundations, 'recognizing themselves as animated by a common purpose and designed to serve a common end,' bound themselves by a solemn compact to assist one another and to promote each other's interests in all lawful ways. It is not surprising that, while the two schools, owing to the diversity of their particular circumstances, developed on somewhat different lines, the colleges which they were severally intended to feed and support should, as their circumstances were more alike, have had a very similar history. Briefly their history was of the following kind. In their earlier period both colleges, and notably King's, produced a number of distinguished scholars; but as time went on this became less and less the case, till, though in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century both colleges can point to a few distinguished names among their *alumni*, yet at this time the mass of the Fellows were neither diligent nor distinguished, but tended to sink more and more into a condition of easy-going and self-indulgent idleness. Nor is the explanation of this far to seek. In the first place, William of Wykeham—and in this he was followed by King Henry VI.—had, for some reason not very easy to understand, withdrawn his Fellows and Scholars from competing for the ordinary University degree. The members of both founda-

Digitized by Google

tions were for many centuries exempted from entering the Schools of the University, and received from their own College authorities the certificate which entitled them to a degree. It has been suggested that Wykeham's reason for making this curious provision was that he hoped to secure among his own Fellows, through the agency of their College examination and exercises, a higher standard of attainment than could be exacted in the University at large. If this were really his intention, his expectations were sadly disappointed. Cut off from the main stream of University life, removed from the healthy competition with other men, the majority of the Scholars of both colleges languished and grew idle, till as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century Laud could raise the query, 'How is it that Scholars come from Winchester so good and leave New College so bad?'—a result which the Archbishop attributed to the premature study of the *Institutes* of Calvin, but one which admitted, perhaps, of other explanations.

Then, again, the close and in course of time the ever more exclusive connexion which existed between the two colleges and the schools which respectively fed them, acted prejudicially upon both the colleges. In its origin the plan might have seemed well devised and likely to secure its object. At a time when the supply of young men fitted to profit by a University education was scanty, or at the best uncertain, it might well seem a reasonable step to train up in a good school, under good traditions and with a satisfactory curriculum, a body of youths qualified to profit by the further education which they would subsequently receive. In this way Wykeham hoped—and Henry VI. endorsed his hope—that he would be able to secure a body of Fellows well fitted to serve God in Church and State, a good supply of educated and learned clergy who should enrich the life of the English Church. But the mixing throughout earlier life with the same set of companions had a cramping and narrowing effect, and those who were not likely to succeed to a Fellowship—itself often granted on the ground of being Founder's kin—drifted

Digitized by Google

off elsewhere, and found in other and wider fields the incentive and stimulus which residence at King's or New College too often failed to convey. The result was that, on the one hand, distinguished Etonians and Wykehamists —and there were always plenty of these—were to be found most often anywhere else than in the academic homes which the founders of these schools had provided for them; while, on the other, the numbers at the colleges shrank from generation to generation, till at last the members of the two foundations were almost restricted to those who either had Fellowships or were certain of succeeding to them.

Then, thirdly, those who were in this apparently enviable position found themselves, when they attained to it, deprived of every incentive and stimulus to exertion. They were in that happy or unfortunate position so tersely described in the well-known epigram on an undistinguished Fellow of Winchester College:

> Quid petat ulterius? Nimis huic, Fortuna, dedisti,
> Cui satis est quod edat, cui nihil est quod agat.

And this was the position which the successful Fellow saw assured to him, not only while he lived at the University but also for life; for either he remained unmarried and kept his Fellowship all his days, in which case he had at least a competence assured to him as a bachelor; or, if he wished to marry, he waited till a college living fell to his turn, and then as far as possible things were made comfortable for him, to induce him to retire and create the vacancy to which some one else was anxious to succeed. Such a system could but lead to one result—the creation of an indolent, self-indulgent set of Fellows: and yet, as we shall see in the sequel, one not incapable of better things.

The general lines which reform followed at each of the two colleges were remarkably similar, in many respects even identical. Thus we observe that the first two steps taken at each foundation—both taken at a period earlier than that covered by the two books before us, earlier, therefore, than

Digitized by Google

the first University Commissions—were the voluntary surrender, at King's under the influence of Provost Oakes, at New College under that of Warden Shuttleworth, of the right to take a University degree without public examination; and, secondly, the opening of scholarships at the respective schools connected with them to public competition. These two steps combined made at least a stirring of intellectual life at both colleges: a better stamp of Scholars was at once introduced, and these, when they went to Oxford or Cambridge, had the healthy stimulus which comes from finding oneself in keen competition with other men. Mr. Augustus Leigh, it is interesting to observe, was one of the early Scholars elected on the foundation at Eton under the new competitive system, while Mr. George was among the last set of boys who owed their election at Winchester to the old system of nomination. A further step in the direction of reform (taken at New College by the advice of the Visitor before the 1854 Commission, but only carried out at King's at a considerably later date) was the admission of Commoners side by side with the Scholars. But this change had for a long time very little effect in practice, as either no Commoners, or very few, presented themselves for admission; and of those presenting themselves many in the earlier years were rejected, since the reforming Fellows determined that none but men willing to read for Honours, and to some extent capable of doing so, should be admitted. It was consequently fully ten years after the date of the first Commission before the numbers of Commoners perceptibly began to grow; but after that time commenced that steady increase in numbers which, continuing during thirty years, has brought New College to the position of being the largest, or nearly the largest, college in Oxford—a position which has come to it in spite of the fact that the restriction that all its members must read for Honours in some final School is, with trifling exceptions, still maintained.

The next considerable step in the reform of the two colleges was the result of the University Commission of 1854. The new statutes (or *Ordinances*, as they were styled), which came into operation at New College in 1859

Digitized by Google

and at King's in 1861, set on a new footing the relations of the two colleges with Winchester and Eton respectively. While the general tendency of the changes inaugurated by the Commission at either University was to remove all local restrictions, privileges of special schools and of Founders' kin, and to throw all scholarships open to unrestricted competition, the Commissioners had shrunk, after some hesitation, from interfering with the century-long connexion which had subsisted between the two colleges and the schools which their founders had associated with them. New College was still to keep its Winchester, King's its Eton scholarships: only in each case the privileges of Founders' kin were abolished. Scholarships which the school could not adequately fill were to be thrown open to competition, and a certain number of open scholarships were to be established side by side with the school scholarships of either foundation. The object of the arrangement—and in both cases it succeeded in effecting its purpose—was that the school scholarships should not fall below the level of the open ones. There was, however, this difference in the two cases: that at New College the number of Winchester scholarships was fixed at six in each year, and their tenure limited to five years, whereas at King's the number was left indefinite, the scholarships, both Eton and open, being provided for by the gradual suppression of Fellowships from time to time, as they successively became vacant. The number of Fellowships was in this way to be gradually reduced from seventy to forty-six, and the number of Eton scholarships raised up to twenty-four in all, with ultimately a similar number of open scholarships. How soon, however, this change was to be carried out became for a time a standing matter of dispute. A further complication arose in this way. The senior Fellows had at King's a customary right to a larger dividend as compared with the juniors. It was not quite clear how far this right was an absolute one, nor even what was the precise way in which the dividend was to be calculated. The authority of the Visitor was invoked to settle the matter, and he gave a decision regarded by many of the

Digitized by Google

junior Fellows as unduly favourable to vested interests. It was rendered all the more onerous by the unfortunate assumption that the prosperity which the College was enjoying at the time when the decision was made would always continue, whereas, in fact, the period of agricultural depression set in very shortly after. Thus it proved in its entirety unworkable, and a compromise had to be effected by which, with a single exception, the seniors refrained from pressing for the full rights which were secured to them under the Visitor's award, and so left sufficient margin for the introduction and working of the new system and for the carrying on of the College under new conditions and on the new lines.

In the negotiations thus happily concluded Augustus Austen Leigh bore a beneficent and prominent, though not always the leading, part. But for the gradual introduction of the new system with a view to, and in defence of which the financial battle was mainly fought, he was almost entirely responsible, only receiving from time to time welcome help and encouragement from his friend and colleague, Henry Bradshaw, the well-known librarian of the Cambridge University Library. He was enabled to effect this in virtue of his position as Tutor, to which he was appointed early in 1868, while the battle about the finances was still raging. There is at Oxford nothing quite comparable to the office of Tutor in one of the smaller colleges at Cambridge. Functions which at Oxford are divided between the head of the college, the General College Meeting, the Tutorial Board or whole body of the Tutors, are at Cambridge concentrated in the hands of a single Tutor. Questions such as the admission of undergraduates, the entrance examination which they shall be required to pass, the general direction of their studies, the provision of lecturers to teach them, are left to a large extent to the Tutor's unaided discretion; and were so left, perhaps, in an unusual degree to Augustus Leigh, in whose fair-mindedness, sagacity and shrewdness the younger Fellows, at any rate, placed almost implicit confidence. Owing to the exceptional position thus granted to him, the creation and

Digitized by Google

organization of the new staff of college lecturers and the general direction and distribution of the course of studies which the then gradually growing body of undergraduates were to follow, devolved directly upon him; and though he had to secure the consent of the College to the more important advances which he had successively to introduce, particularly to the erection of blocks of new buildings in which the increasing number of undergraduates could be housed, the consent and support of the College Meeting were in these years never, or scarcely ever, denied him. It was in this way that he succeeded in building up, at least in general outline, an efficient and satisfactory lecturing staff, and came to be regarded as the real founder of new King's. In addition to this he undertook during the same years the office of Dean, to which at King's the care of the chapel services and the choir are mainly entrusted. Here, too, he introduced many useful reforms, and it was under his guiding hands that the services of the noble chapel assumed that stately and reverent character for which they have now been long renowned.

The same problems with which he had to deal had been solved with less friction and difficulty at New College at a somewhat earlier period. The financial difficulties, owing to the presence and pressure of vested interests, which loomed so large at King's, were much less felt in the sister foundation. This was due partly to the fact that the seniors did not possess the same privileged position as at King's, partly to their not unduly insisting on, or pressing, rights which perhaps they had. The resources, also, of the college, carefully husbanded as they were by two Bursars of exceptional ability, proved adequate to meet the needs both of the older and the newer system. As to the Tutorial staff, again, not only did New College take over from its older phase a band of Tutors of exceptional force, ability, and wisdom, well fitted to launch it in its new career, but it secured in Mr. Alfred Robinson, almost the first elected of its new open Fellows, a man of supreme judgement and force of character, one of those rare personalities eminently fitted to found and build up a new

Digitized by Google

order of things on an old foundation. In its then Warden, too, Dr. Sewell, it had a head of open mind and loyalty of character, who, while bound by chains of strong attachment to the old order, was yet prepared to give the new a fair and impartial trial, and to accept and work to the best of his power every change which the College as a whole deliberately determined to adopt. Once again, all changes which might seem to further the efficiency of the college, though they had, of course, to be started by individual initiative, were introduced and discussed in the General College Meeting, and after the Ordinance—as the new statutes enacted by the Commission were called—was in working order, had to obtain a two-thirds majority, if they involved any departure from its provisions, before they could be submitted to the Privy Council for ratification. This provided, on the one hand, for ample discussion and consideration before the inauguration of any important change, but, on the other, secured to the College a wide liberty of action in cases where altered circumstances made the introduction of changes imperative or even very desirable. In a third particular New College was more fortunate than King's, in that it maintained much more fully than King's succeeded in doing, a real and vital connexion with the school with which their respective founders had associated each. Not only from the first were six Scholars elected annually from Winchester, if six Scholars good enough for the purpose could be found, but the old custom of making the election at Winchester was retained. The result has been that it is the normal ambition of a Winchester boy to 'get off' to New College, while New College itself has had a steady nucleus of good Winchester Scholars animated with affection for the college as the senior member of Wykeham's foundation, and anxious in every way to support its good name. With them the open Scholars, from time to time elected, have entered into friendly rivalry, in which the Winchester Scholars have certainly not had the worst of it, and both alike have furnished an excellent intellectual centre to the college which has been both a stimulant and a steadying influence to the Commoners

Digitized by Google

who have gradually grown up around them. Between King's and Eton the connexion has been less close, mainly for two reasons. No fixed number of Scholars to be elected annually was under the new statutes assigned to Eton, and an Eton boy could never be sure, if he reached a sufficiently high position in the school, of going off to King's; while the decision to which the Fellows came of holding the election at Cambridge rather than at Eton was, from the point of view of the connexion between the school and the college, an unfortunate one.

The years from 1868 to 1880 were a period of much reforming activity and zeal at both colleges. The two questions which, during those years, most occupied the minds of reformers at both universities, were the removal of the restriction of celibacy from holders of Fellowships, and the best mode of appointment to them, as also to the college offices for which Fellowships were in part a provision. In attempting to solve these two questions the two colleges took a somewhat leading part in their respective universities. Both questions arose, directly or indirectly, out of the action of the earlier Universities Commission. The general effects of the action of that Commission had been to make the work of teaching at the two universities a possible, and an actual, profession; while the passing of the Universities Tests Act, in 1871, made it a profession which would be more and more thrown open to laymen. But in these circumstances it was natural, and indeed inevitable, that there should arise a demand that the restriction of celibacy, as the condition of continuing to hold a Fellowship, should be relaxed or abolished. So long as college teaching and college offices were mainly, if not exclusively, in the hands of clergymen, who would ultimately succeed to college livings, it was just a possibility (yet a possibility against which many chafed) that those engaged in college work would defer their marriage to such time as they could obtain a college living which would enable them to support a wife and possibly a family. But laymen had not this possibility before them; and when they came to take a full part in college work, it was certain

Digitized by Google

that they would not be content either to remain single for an indefinite period or, if they married, to give up a large part of their income, and with it the privilege of remaining members of the Governing Body of the College. Various attempts were made to solve the problem, which certainly was not without its difficulties. If indiscriminate permission were given to all Fellows, when once elected, to marry, not only would the succession to Fellowships become unendurably slow, but a large part of the college revenues would be used to very little purpose in subsidizing people who had adopted professions away from the university—a clear waste of college endowments. But, on the other hand, how, it was asked, could a selection be made among men who had won their Fellowships exactly under the same conditions? The solution ultimately arrived at by New College, and afterwards by King's, was to give the College liberty to retain in its service and allow to marry such of its Fellows, being actually engaged in the work of the College, as it should seem to the College to be in its interest so to retain, and that for any term of years it might decide. This plan, while giving to no Fellow a right to marry and keep his Fellowship, did enable the College to retain in its service for so long as it desired teachers and other officers of proved value and experience. The other difficulty was that Fellows elected under a purely competitive system, such as that contemplated in the Ordinance, might have neither the inclination nor, perhaps, the capacity to fill a particular college post at the time when it happened to be vacant. A change in the New College Ordinance, assented to by Privy Council, empowered the College to elect without examination under special circumstances a man who might seem to the Fellows eminently qualified to fill a particular post in the College. The College made a limited number of elections under this amendment of the Ordinance to its own great advantage. King's took a further step in this direction by asking for and obtaining powers for the Governing Body, 'to extend the duration of the Fellowship in the case of persons eminent for learning or science, or of persons whose studies are likely to be of

Digitized by Google

material service in the promotion of any art or science.' One other movement endorsed and adopted by the subsequent Commission was, though not inaugurated very early, adopted by New College and also by King's, viz. the system of intercollegiate lectures, or rather of the interchange of lectures between different colleges and college tutors. This system, suggested in the first instance by the late Master of Balliol, took shape first in a proposal for an interchange of lectures between Balliol and New College; but it quickly spread to other colleges and was finally made by the new Commission universal at Oxford and in a less degree at Cambridge also.

The labours of the two University Commissions, appointed in 1877 and continued till 1879, occupy a somewhat prominent place in both the books under consideration. The Commissions were, however, mainly engaged in dealing with problems which had been thought of, and had obtained a partial solution, in each of the two colleges. In many respects the Commissioners accepted conclusions which had been already reached by the colleges themselves; in others they carried to their logical conclusion principles the colleges had accepted; while in a few particulars they imposed conditions which did not altogether approve themselves to the colleges concerned. The main matters dealt with by the Commissioners were three—the provision of a permanent and adequate teaching staff within the college itself; the emoluments and tenure of Fellowships and Scholarships; the contributions which Colleges might reasonably be expected to make to University purposes. On the first of these heads the Commission had to do little more than confirm and render permanent arrangements which had already been made. Dividing the Fellowships at New College into three classes, ordinary, tutorial, and professorial, they provided the second class with an additional endowment out of college funds, limited their maximum number to ten and constituted them the permanent element in the college staff. All tutorial Fellows were permitted to marry, provided that a sufficient number of Fellows were resident within the college walls to maintain order and

Digitized by Google

discipline. At Cambridge, where, as already noticed, the distinction between Tutor and Lecturer is greater than it is in Oxford, and the dignity of the Tutor is greater, the existing arrangements were on the whole confirmed; only at King's educational matters were to a great extent removed from the cognizance of the General College Meeting and placed in the hands of an Educational Committee. Mr. W. Austen Leigh states that this system has been found to work satisfactorily and assures us that it is one of the reforms to which his brother attached great importance; it may, however, be doubted whether there is not some advantage in the principles even of educational questions being decided by the General College Meeting, though the working out of details may have to be left to Committees. A certain amount of independent and outside criticism is thus secured which can scarcely fail to be a wholesome element.

The second point was the value and tenure of Scholarships and Fellowships. In the case of both colleges the value of scholarships was reduced, being fixed at a maximum of 80*l.* Their tenure was also reduced from five (or at King's even more) to four years. At Oxford scholarships had further to be renewed at the end of two years, the Tutor having to certify as a condition of renewal that the holder has been diligent and well conducted; while at King's the entrance scholarships were supplemented or replaced at the end of two years by college scholarships which were rewards for work done at Cambridge itself. The value of an ordinary Fellowship was fixed at New College at 200*l.* a year, while at King's it was to be 250*l.* or of such other value as the funds of the College permitted; as a matter of fact, Mr. Leigh tells us that it has not since the days of agricultural depression reached at any time quite 100*l.* The tenure was fixed at New College at seven years, with an extension to eight years in the case of those who had done work for the College or the University; at King's at six years, but it might rise in amount, as we have seen, to 250*l.* a year if the funds of the College permitted it. The restriction of celibacy as a condition of tenure was at both universities entirely removed.

Digitized by Google

But it was on the question of what contribution could fairly be expected and asked for from the College revenues to the University that the greatest difficulties arose. At New College something had already been done in this direction, as ever since the days of the Ordinance the College had contributed to the stipends of the two Savilian Professors (of Geometry and Astronomy); while at King's the matter had been discussed but no actual step had been taken. As one of the primary objects of the Commissions at both universities was to secure larger contributions from the Colleges for University purposes, it was certain that in neither case would matters be allowed to stand exactly where they were. The recommendations of the Commissioners of 1878 were based upon the figures of the Cleveland Commission which had inquired into and reported in 1873 on the revenue of the Universities and the Colleges. This Commission, conducting its inquiries in a period of unexampled agricultural prosperity, had estimated that the resources of the Colleges would remain at, or would even exceed, the high-water mark they had then touched. The event—as alas! is too well known—has by no means justified their rosy anticipations. The consequence was that the subsequent Commission, basing its awards on these fallacious anticipations, imposed at both Universities burdens on the Colleges which they found themselves in many instances unable to sustain. New College, in addition to a moderate contribution to the Common University Fund, was to contribute to or support entirely five University Professors who, as they were successively constituted, were to become Fellows of the College. Two of them, the Savilian Professors, had been already taken on under the provisions of the earlier Ordinance; only they became now full Fellows of the College. Two others, the Wykeham Professorship of Logic and the Wykeham Professorship of Physics, have been in the years that have elapsed since the Commission the one wholly, the other almost completely, endowed. The condition of the funds of the College has not yet permitted the constitution of the fifth Professorship, the Wykeham Professorship of Ancient History. The two Wykeham

Digitized by Google

Professors, like the two Savilian, have been admitted Fellows of the College.

The burden imposed on King's was not so heavy. It paid its quota to the aggregate sum, estimated ultimately to amount to 30,000*l.* a year, which was to be contributed by the Colleges jointly for University purposes. Four Professorial Fellowships were in addition to be maintained by it out of its resources; only at Cambridge, differing in this respect from Oxford, the Colleges were left free to select to what Professorships these Fellowships should be attached. As the agricultural depression has pressed more heavily on Cambridge than on Oxford, the Cambridge colleges have been even further removed than those at Oxford from being able to contribute the full amount that was expected of them to the needs of the University.

The years which have elapsed since 1880 have been mainly spent in working out in practice the reforms which the 1877 Commission inaugurated. Such periods of comparative calm must inevitably follow epochs of change and energetic reform, if any good work is to be done. It is impossible to work any institution satisfactorily if it is to be undergoing perpetual change. Austen Leigh, first as Tutor and Dean, then as Provost, had the pleasure of seeing the various reforms, which he had taken so large a part in devising, come gradually into practice, and justify themselves in most instances by the touchstone of experience. At both colleges work still remained to be done, but it was work for the most part of a supplementary kind. Additional new buildings had in these years to be provided to meet the increasing number of undergraduates who continued to flock to them. Austen Leigh's first business almost as Provost was to superintend the erection of a new block which was put up near the Cam, from the designs of Mr. Bodley, while New College supplemented the stiff and heavy, if somewhat stately, pile designed by Sir Gilbert Scott, by the more ornamental buildings which Mr. Basil Champneys has in the last twenty years erected—the two being connected by the fine entrance tower, also designed by Mr. Champneys and erected as a memorial to Mr. Alfred

Digitized by Google

Robinson. At King's soon after the new statutes were passed we find Augustus Leigh, then Vice-Provost, drawing up a scheme for the better provision of college teaching. The scheme proposed by him was not carried out in its entirety, as the revenues of the College had in the years which followed its promulgation seriously diminished, but its main principles were adhered to and its author was able as Provost to assist and to superintend its working as well as that of many other features of college life for which in his earlier days he had been responsible. For, while at Cambridge it is inevitable that a large part of the time and energy of the Head of a House should be taken up in the management of University business, and the Provost of King's took a full share in such work and by his known fairness and his conciliatory disposition obtained the acceptance of many reforms which were advantageous to the University; yet with Austen Leigh the life and interests of his own College remained, after he had become Provost, his main passion as it had been before, and it was as Tutor, Dean and Provost of King's during the stirring days of its reconstruction, that he will be, and would have wished to be, chiefly remembered.

Next to the successful working of the new statutes, which had of course to be brought gradually into operation and for the successful working of which in their earlier years Mr. Alfred Robinson, who had been to so large an extent their author, was largely responsible, two subjects have in the last two decades mainly occupied the attention of the Fellows of New College. The first of these is the establishment on a satisfactory footing of a scheme of pensions which shall provide for those who during a long period of years have taken a full share in college work; the other has been the introduction of greater elasticity in the mode of electing to Fellowships, so as to secure, on the one hand, more ample opportunities for selecting younger men, if necessary without examination, who may be invited to take a part in college work; on the other hand, to be able to enroll among the Fellows men of ability who have already done good work or give promise of being able to do good

Digitized by Google

work, in the field of original research. Amendments to the statutes intended to further both these objects have recently received the assent of the Privy Council, and the College has availed itself partly of the powers given to it under the statutes of 1878, partly of the ampler liberties which it has since acquired, to add to the roll of its Fellows several men of distinction who have rendered valuable service to the University. It is interesting to note in this connexion that in addition to the four Professors who are attached to the College by the statutes, no fewer than five of its other Fellows are at the present time engaged in doing, either as professors, lecturers or demonstrators, what may properly be regarded as University as opposed to specifically College work.

We have thus traced how during a period of fifty years these two foundations, starting with similar objects, the later of them founded in conscious imitation of the older, have gradually transformed themselves, or been transformed, so as to serve wider uses than in the past and to accommodate themselves more fully to altered conditions on lines which, though not, of course, identical, are still parallel. In both cases the two books placed at the head of this article suffice to shew that the work of reform has been conscientiously and effectively done. Both colleges were fortunate in finding leaders competent to deal with the emergency they were called upon to face; the leaders in both cases were backed by a majority of the Fellows who while recognizing the need for reform were anxious to retain and strengthen whatever was good and sound in the traditions of the past. At both colleges the old order has changed and given place to new: we trust and believe that both alike will find in that new order larger opportunities of usefulness, an increased sphere of influence, and a stronger hold upon the national life.

We cannot withhold a word of praise in conclusion as to the way in which the two authors have carried out the task which they respectively set themselves. Mr. George's monograph is a model of arrangement, clearness of statement, accuracy and tactful treatment. The tale

Digitized by Google

which he has unfolded will be found interesting and instructive by the general public, while it will be appreciated even more warmly by those who have a closer tie with the College which he has served so long and so faithfully. Mr. William Austen Leigh's larger work is as charming as a biography as it is faithful and accurate as an account of those College reforms with which his brother's name will always be so intimately associated. The pictures of family life at Scarlett's and Bray, of the father who in addition to serving his church so devotedly, brought up his sons with such diligence and watchfulness, of the school life in college at Eton in the late fifties, of the domestic happiness and liberal hospitality enjoyed and practised in the Provost's Lodgings at King's, linger in the memory, and will serve to hand down to posterity an aspect of life in the latter half of the nineteenth century which might otherwise not have found a chronicler: an aspect of which the present and the last generation will have no reason to be ashamed.

Digitized by Google

ART. III.—THE BENEDICTINE ABBEY OF WESTMINSTER.

1. *Missale ad usum Ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, nunc primum typis mandatum curante JOHANNE WICKHAM LEGG. 'Henry Bradshaw Society.' (London: 1891, 1893, 1896.)
2. *Customary of the Benedictine Monasteries of Saint Augustine, Canterbury, and Saint Peter, Westminster.* Edited by Sir EDWARD MAUNDE THOMPSON, K.C.B. 'Henry Bradshaw Society.' (London: 1902, 1904.)
3. *Westminster Abbey, its Story and Associations.* By Mrs. A. MURRAY SMITH [E. T. BRADLEY]. (London: Cassell & Co, 1906.)
4. *Westminster Abbey and the Kings' Craftsmen: a Study of Mediæval Building.* By W. R. LETHABY. (London: Duckworth, 1906.)
5. *The Obituary Roll of John Islip, Abbot of Westminster, 1500–1532, with Notes on other English Obituary Rolls.* By W. H. ST. JOHN HOPE, Esq., M.A. 'Vetusta Monumenta.' (Westminster: Society of Antiquaries, 1906.)

OUR knowledge of the history of the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster has hardly advanced since Richard Widmore wrote in 1751. Widmore was Librarian to the Dean and Chapter, and he did a priceless work in arranging and classifying their muniments, many of which would have been completely devoured by beetles or damp but for his timely care. The knowledge which he thus gained enabled him to write a succinct narrative of the history of the Abbey, in which his judgement and his accuracy are seldom at fault. In more recent times Mr. Burtt largely added to the detail of Widmore's skeleton catalogue, and published a certain amount of interesting material for the Historical Manuscripts Commission. At the present time Dr. Edward Scott, formerly Keeper of the Manuscripts at the British Museum, is engaged in the laborious task of describing every document, preserving so far as possible Widmore's original arrangement. Despair of coping with so vast and

Digitized by Google

multifarious a collection of materials is perhaps the cause why no advance of a serious kind has been made in the early history of the Abbey.

Stanley, indeed, has described inimitably the coronations and the funerals of our sovereigns, the monuments of the illustrious dead, the vicissitudes of a great national institution which has reflected every change in the nation's life. His *Memorials* can never be superseded: the beauty of their style, the skill of their arrangement, and the truth of the historical pictures which they present, have won for them a place in English literature. Much has been learned since he wrote, many of his statements must be corrected; but Stanley had a genius for accumulating illustrative facts and employing them aptly in the reproduction of historical scenes; the wealth of his information is amazing, and he always gives the authority for what he says. The student will value his book in proportion to the extent of his own research.

But Stanley had no kind of sympathy with the monks. Thanks to Widmore's labours, he was able to sketch the story of the Abbots in a few bright pages, and to trace the exemption from episcopal control which he probably counted their most precious legacy; but he had neither taste nor capacity for the investigation of the confused treasures of the Muniment Room, which contain all the petty details out of which the life of the monastery must some day be laboriously reconstructed.

Stanley's *Memorials* were divided into compartments and classified according to subject-matter; they did not profess to give a continuous history. It was accordingly possible for a good book to be written on other lines, telling the whole story in chronological sequence; and this was skilfully accomplished by a daughter of the late Dean Bradley in a popular volume entitled *Annals of Westminster Abbey*. Gracefully written and unencumbered by notes, it serves, especially in its recent and more compact form, as an excellent introduction for the general reader; but the student is perplexed when he finds much fresh information which he cannot easily trace to its original sources.

Digitized by Google

A new kind of book has been given to us by Mr. W. R. Lethaby, who within a few days of its publication was called to the responsibility of succeeding his friend Mr. Micklethwaite as surveyor of the fabric which he had so long and so eagerly studied. Some years ago Mr. Lethaby began to grapple with the problem of the personality of the builders who constructed our great English churches. He was not to be satisfied with the commonplaces that 'they were built by the monks,' and that 'there were no architects in those days.' He remembered that the Abbey in particular had been built by kings: he picked out from fabric rolls and other documents preserved among state records the names of the master masons of successive kings, and he shewed that these men with the master carpenters must have the credit of the great design. In his new book he focusses the result of his inquiries. Three master masons, Henry of Westminster (1244–1253), John of Gloucester (1253–1262), Robert of Beverley (1262–1280), were in turn responsible for the rebuilding of the choir and transepts and the first bays of the nave, which King Henry III. ordered and paid for. The courage which could throw down Edward's magnificent choir was the King's; the genius and the skill which erected what we see to-day must be credited primarily to Henry the Mason, and in due measure to his gifted successors.

These names, indeed, are not quite new to us: they are to be found in Scott's *Gleanings*, and lurking in difficult documents printed by Willis or Burtt. But Mr. Lethaby has discovered the men who bore the names, and has made them live again in the pages of architectural history. He finds Henry of Westminster sent to plan fortifications at York Castle: John of Gloucester working at Woodstock, and designing a gate-way which still stands at Guildford; Robert of Beverley repairing Westminster Palace after a fire, and completing the Tower of London for King Edward III. He knows where his masons lived, and that John married Alice and Robert Cecily. Moreover, these three head a long list of master masons, master carpenters, sculptors, painters and other craftsmen, to the number of

Digitized by Google

three hundred or more: not all, indeed, engaged on the Abbey church or in the King's employ, but all worthy to be rescued from oblivion, if only to condemn our long neglect.

It is a natural result of these researches that much fresh material is available for fixing the exact dates of various portions of the fabric. In this important work Sir Gilbert Scott had led the way, and his conclusions were partially corrected, but largely confirmed, by the late Mr. Micklethwaite, of whom Mr. Lethaby speaks as 'an almost infallible authority on the Abbey.' It is satisfactory to be told after a full and independent examination of all the available material that 'there cannot be a doubt as to the correctness of the dates assigned to the different parts by Mr. Micklethwaite.'

Having irrefutably demonstrated the English nationality of our builders, Mr. Lethaby delights to shew that they placed themselves under the most progressive influences of their day, and imitated without reserve what was new and admirable in the great churches of France. The following dates are instructive:

'When Westminster was begun the choir of Reims had been consecrated four years; the Sainte Chapelle in Paris was well advanced, and it was consecrated in 1248; the nave of Amiens was finished, its vast choir was just being begun, and it was *completed* in the same year, 1269, in which Henry III.'s work at Westminster was consecrated. Beauvais, the mightiest choir of them all, was begun in 1247 and finished in 1271, thus exactly following Westminster at an interval of two years' (p. 116).

A more elaborate comparison than has hitherto been made results in the judgement that Reims, the coronation church of France, was primarily followed: 'our windows and radiating chapels we may speak of as *copies* of those at Reims'; the pillars and their bases are closely similar, though the four smaller shafts at Westminster are separated from the central column, because they are of English Purbeck. Moreover, 'at Reims, and at Westminster, the capitals of the piers were linked together with a system of iron ties passing across at the springing of the arches'; at

Digitized by Google

Reims the iron hooks only which held the bars remain; this is so in certain parts of our church too, though elsewhere the bars of iron, and in some instances bars of wood, are as the builders left them. The Sainte Chapelle offers the pattern of the Chapter House windows, and also of some of the earliest tracery in the cloister. Our great north portal corresponds too closely in design with the west front of Amiens to allow us to regard it as an independent creation.

The proofs of these resemblances are given in detail and illustrated by drawings. Mr. Lethaby reads his building as a document, and he traces its composite elements with the security with which Dr. Luard analyzed the *Flores Historiarum*. The internal evidence, so to speak, appears irrefragable; but we could wish to see it supported by external evidence—by some historic reference to intercourse between the English and the French masons. Did our master masons travel to see the work of their contemporaries? or did French masters come over here and give their guidance? We find a French marbler, Master Richard Paris, and a famous French painter, John St. Omer, in the earliest accompts; but these names do not offer a solution of the problem, and no evidence has been brought to shew that Master Henry ever crossed the Channel.

Great as are the similarities between our English church and the churches of France, the contrasts are not less significant, and we welcome the considered verdict which claims it after all as 'one of the most English of English buildings':

> 'We may readily make the fullest allowance for French influence at Westminster, for so entirely is it translated into the terms of English detail that the result is triumphantly English' (p. 125).

His enthusiasm for the great north porch has led Mr. Lethaby to make some trenchant criticisms upon its recent remodelling; but he does more than idly complain of what is new—he gives us a minute study of its original form.

Digitized by Google

The interesting pencil drawing of it, which must be Hollar's first sketch, and which chances to be preserved in Pepys' scrap-book at Magdalene College, Cambridge, has not escaped him. A yet earlier representation of it, however, is to be seen on a seal exhibited in the Chapter House. When the Dean and prebendaries were abolished by the Long Parliament, the Abbey was ruled at first by a Committee of both Houses, and after 1649 by a body called the Governors of the School and Almshouses of Westminster. Never were the finances of the Abbey more carefully handled than by those eminent laymen: every item of expenditure was noted, every voucher was kept. Among the bills there remains a receipt from Thomas Symons, the London goldsmith, for 25*l.* for making the new seal of the Governors. This seal had on one side the House of Commons in session, and on the other the great north porch of the Abbey church. The one impression which happens to remain is fortunately a good one: it is reproduced in Mr. Russell Barker's *Life of Dr. Busby*. This seal and Hollar's first sketch (though not his subsequent engraving) give the only existing pictures of the house on the right hand of the porch, which was occupied by William Laud when he was a prebendary, and at the back door of which, in the irony of history, the bodies of most of the Parliamentarians exhumed at the Restoration were ignominiously reinterred.

Mr. Lethaby is probably right in conjecturing that the foundations which still exist beneath the grass at this spot are those of the great Sacristy, which King Henry III. ordered to be built in 1251. A prebendary's house stood there in the time of King Edward VI., and next to it was a tenement once called Mason's Lodge. There is an item in the fabric rolls for the building of a lodge for the masons, and we may fairly assign this as its site. The dimensions and position of Mason's Lodge are ascertainable from the leases of later years, and it is interesting to note that it stood just 120 feet to the west of the north porch; for King Henry III.'s Sacristy was ordered to be 120 feet long. A further confirmation of this position for the Sacristy is to be found in the Sacrists' roll for 1535, where there is an entry

Digitized by Google

of fourpence expended 'for pyche, rossen and canvas for mending of a pype in Sent Margetts churchyarde cumyng to the sextery.'

Another house is shewn on the seal of the Governors, standing east of the north porch. It is probable that this occupied the site of the plumbery and waxchandlery, which formed part of the Sacrist's offices. As the Sacristy could be entered from the nave by what is now called 'the Demons' Door,' so these offices had direct communication with the north transept by a door in its eastern wall. Among the early Chapter Orders (July 9, 1547) is one to the effect that the plumbery and waxchandlery be removed to the vaults under the great granary (in Dean's Yard—long used as the school dormitory), and that the door into the church be 'mured up.' This door was opened again by Mr. Pearson in 1896; if our identification be correct, Mr. Lethaby's sigh over the removal of the filling—'probably mediæval and done c. 1400 when the chapel was made'—may be recalled.

It would be easy to give further proof that *Westminster Abbey and the Kings' Craftsmen* is a book which makes a solid contribution to the history of the Abbey from the architectural and artistic points of view. Nothing so thorough has yet been achieved, and we may hope that its author, who has hitherto known only so much of the Abbey muniments as can be learnt from the Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, will prosecute his searches still further under more favourable conditions. There still waits for him a field of interest in the investigation and identification of the extensive remains of the monastic buildings. In regard to these our best source of information is a paper written by Mr. Micklethwaite many years before he came into official connexion with the Abbey. So far as he had access to the ancient work, much of which is covered up in the houses built for prebendaries and other residents in the Close, his descriptions are excellent. His knowledge of monastic institutions made him an admirable interpreter of what he saw. But his identifications often rested on materials gathered in a somewhat

Digitized by Google

haphazard manner by the late Mr. Walcott, and he did not as a rule go behind the printed sources. We are accordingly still left in doubt as to the site of the Prior's house, though it was of considerable extent and contained a hall and a chapel; and the position confidently assigned by Walcott and all subsequent antiquaries to the Misericord, in which the monks commonly dined in later times, is almost certainly wrong. The two problems perhaps are to be solved together, and it may be that when we have transferred the Misericord to its true place on the map, we shall find a reasonable space for the Prior's lodging. When the new Bishop of Westminster displaced the Abbot from his ancient house, what could be more likely than that the latter, now become Dean, should occupy the house of next dignity within the precincts? Dionysius Dalyon, the Prior, had become a prebendary indeed, but only in the sixth stall, with five seniors above him brought in from outside; he could therefore have no kind of claim to remain where he was. We know as a fact that the new Dean's house occupied a part at least of the ground on which Ashburnham House now stands—and it is the other part of that house which has hitherto been held to be the site of the Misericord. Presently we shall believe that the Misericord was 'contiguous to the Refectory,' as the old Customary has long told us: we shall also find a reason for thinking that, as at Durham, it was not on the ground-floor. The topography of the precincts, in fact, has been very scantily investigated. The ancient leases prove that in letting houses to eminent persons within the Close the Dean and Chapter made no new departure: besides less conspicuous examples we actually find Abbot Esteney in the first year of King Henry VII. letting his own house to Elizabeth Wydeville, the widowed Queen of Edward IV., with a special clause in the lease for the cleansing and repair of the gutter of the kitchen. Twice before had she taken sanctuary here, but now she was not allowed to remain in such close proximity to the Court and was removed to a perpetual seclusion in the Abbey of Bermondsey. The early leases and others of a later date incidentally mention the adjoining monastic

Digitized by Google

buildings, and offer material out of which it may presently be possible to map out the precincts with sufficient exactness.

When we turn from the buildings to the men who lived in them, we find much ready to our hand which should help us to realize the manner of their life. The Henry Bradshaw Society has done excellent service in printing the great Missal of Abbot Litlington, the cost of the making of which in 1384 has been found in the Muniment Room. Even more important guidance as to the liturgical practice, as well as to the social life, of the Abbey is furnished by the same Society's edition of Abbot Ware's Customary. This was one of several books which escaped from its proper custody into the Cottonian Library; and it was partially burnt within the precincts in the lamentable fire at Ashburnham House. Forty years ago its charred pages were copied so far as was possible by the skill of the present Director of the British Museum. Then it was pointed out by Mr. Edmund Bishop that a Customary of St. Augustine's Canterbury so closely resembled ours that by its aid many of the gaps could be securely filled. Both of the Customaries are now printed and challenge critical investigation. The Westminster book was begun in 1266, but it contains entries subsequent to the death of King Henry III. It is based on the much less elaborate Constitutions of Lanfranc, portions of which it frequently embodies. The Canterbury Customary will almost certainly prove to be a revision of the Westminster book with a view to its adaptation to local requirements—a revision which sometimes leaves Westminster peculiarities imperfectly eliminated. Conservative as the monasteries were, we must nevertheless be on our guard against arguing from a thirteenth century Customary in dealing with later periods. Specially must we bear in mind that its topographical references belong to the Norman Abbey. Litlington's rebuilding of the monastic offices and of the Abbot's house came a century later; and one change that he made was to move the Cellarer's department from the west side of the cloister to give the Abbot more room. The new

Digitized by Google

choir was not consecrated when this book was begun, and the Norman nave was walled off from the new work. That a warning at this point is not unnecessary will presently appear.

The history of the monastery reaches its climax, and practically its close, with the rule of a great Abbot. We shall never get another such picture of an English Abbot as Jocelyn of Brakelond has drawn of Abbot Sampson; the biographer and his subject form one of those happy conjunctions which produce permanent literature. But a modern historian could find records enough to write a straightforward account of Abbot Islip, which would be a useful illustration of the last days of monasticism in England. Githslepe or Islip, near Oxford, was the Confessor's birthplace and he bestowed it on his new Abbey. The monks frequently found recruits among the clever boys on their country estates: in religion the surname was dropped, and the local designation took its place. The surname of John Islip has not yet been found, though it has been shrewdly conjectured for more than one reason that it may have been Giles. In a curious note-book, which contains the fragment of a diary and many pages of accompts, Islip on becoming Prior in 1498 recorded the leading dates of his life. He became a monk in his sixteenth year on St. Benedict's day, 1480; he sang his first Mass on the Feast of the Circumcision, 1486, before he was twenty-two, in accordance with a special privilege of Westminster; the next year he became Chaplain to the Abbot, and in 1492 Treasurer and Monk Bailey. We may add that he was elected Abbot in 1500, and died in 1532.

This note-book preserves a story which Islip heard told at the Abbot's table on Sunday, March 3, 1493. A priest travelling with his servants had deflected from the main road, and put up for the night at a lonely inn. In stabling the horses the servants find under the straw two corpses. Their master calls the hostess, and declares that he must leave at once. She pleads that the supper is cooked, and demands a reason for his unusual conduct. He is forced to tell her what has been discovered, and she readily

Digitized by Google

explains that two knights were there the previous day, and their servants quarrelled and fought: her husband had undertaken to bury the corpses secretly. Over-persuaded, but ill at ease, the priest remained. At night, as he lay on his bed, still dressed, the landlord came to the door, offering him apples and wine. When he refused to open, the landlord broke in with eleven men behind him, and bade the priest prepare himself for instant death. The good man thoughtfully requested that he might shrive his servants, who were to share his fate. The ruse saved him; they fought desperately and drove off their assailants with much loss, and went unharmed on their way. The story is well told in Islip's homely but sufficient Latin; and we may regret that, as so often happens, the enthusiasm of the diarist did not extend beyond a few pages.

When George Fascet was made Abbot, in 1498, John Islip succeeded him as Prior: and two years later, October 27, 1500, he succeeded him as Abbot. The notarial instrument describing and attesting his election is printed in full by Widmore in his appendix (pp. 234–244). On the day before, John Islip the Prior and thirty-eight monks assembled in the Chapter House in the presence of Thomas Chamberlayn the notary, Richard Rawlyns, doctor in divinity, Edward Vaughan and William Haryngton, doctors in law; they declared the vacancy, and announced that they had the King's licence to elect a new Abbot; then they fixed the election for Tuesday, October 27, with power to adjourn if necessary. On the morrow at the time appointed, the Prior and forty-three monks were present: the Mass of the Holy Ghost was sung at the high altar, and when it was finished the bells sounded for the Chapter. When all were assembled, Dr. Rawlyns preached from the text, *Pro patribus tuis nati sunt tibi filii: constitues eos principes.* No one present could have foreseen the illustration of the text which the next half century would bring; few survived to see the old order pass into the new; yet a young monk, Thomas Elfride by name, took part in that election and lived to be installed as a prebendary in December 1540.

The sermon ended, *Veni Creator* was sung, and the

Digitized by Google

letters patent of King Henry VII. were read, bidding them to elect a new Abbot, 'qui Deo devotus, ecclesiae vestrae necessarius, nobisque et regno nostro utilis et fidelis existat.' The Prior and convent then nominated Edward Vaughan to be director of the election, and the notary, the preacher and four others to be witnesses. The names of all the monks were read, and it was declared that all who had a right to vote were present. Proclamation was next made at the Chapter House door that all who claimed an interest in the election should come and assert their claim, and a solemn monition and protestation was entered against the participation of any disqualified person in the election. Then Master Vaughan read out the conciliar constitution, *Quia propter*, setting forth the forms of election, and demanded of the Prior and convent by what method they desired to proceed. They answered that they would proceed *per viam Spiritus Sancti*, and William Lambard, the second of the seniors,[1] rose and nominated the Prior, John Islip. At once, without interval, consultation, or even signal—'by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, as it is firmly believed'—the whole body of monks with one mouth and one heart proclaimed Islip the Abbot of their choice.[2] Then William Lambard, with the consent of all but the Prior himself, declared the election complete and proceeded to record it in writing. The Sub-prior, John Holond, hereupon became president of the Chapter, and with the assent of his brethren, Islip as before excepted, empowered Master Edward Vaughan to announce the result. *Te Deum* was chanted by the monks as they led Islip through the cloister to the high altar, where Master Vaughan standing by his side proclaimed the election to the clergy and people. The Sub-prior and his brethren returned without Islip to the Chapter House, and nominated as proctors William Lambard and

[1] The senior of all, John Ramsay, had not been present on the previous day; and possibly he was too infirm to take a prominent part.

[2] At the election of Ralph de Bourne as Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, in 1309, the monks decided 'per viam procedere compromissi,' *i.e.* by choosing seven of their number as electors, and pledging themselves to accept their choice. The whole proceeding is described in the Canterbury *Customary* (H.B.S.) i. 16–31.

Digitized by Google

Richard Charyng, the next in seniority, to convey the formal announcement of his election to their Abbot-elect, and to use their utmost entreaties to bring him to accept the office. The proctors proceeded with the notary and two of the witnesses to a parlour in the Prior's lodging, where, after a first refusal, Islip yielded and gave in writing his formal consent.

A curious chance has preserved to us a document which carries on the story. On a fly-leaf of Abbot Litlington's Missal there is a copy of the notarial instrument which records the solemn reception of the new Abbot by the convent, and his taking the customary oath. On November 25, Islip, escorted by a distinguished company, came from the Chapel of St. Mary Magdalen, near Tothill, and was met in the cemetery, not far from the west door of the church, by five of the senior monks. One of these, John Waterden, the infirmarer, handed him a schedule containing the Abbot's oath to observe 'all rights, statutes, and laudable constitutions and customs of the monastery,' as they were observed by the Abbots his predecessors. He recited the oath, and kissed the Book of the Gospels. He then advanced and was met by the Sub-prior and the monks, bearing Book, Cross and Pastoral Staff. He knelt and kissed the Book, and they all moved on in procession into the church.

The new Abbot, following the example of his two predecessors, Esteney and Fascet, took into his own hands the Sacrist's office, to which belonged the chief responsibility for the maintenance of the fabric. Esteney was already Sacrist when he was made Abbot, and it was probably his interest in the building operations that led him to keep the office; he did much to complete the west end of the nave, and the great west window is attributed to him. Islip seems to have gone on with the work: in his Funeral Roll, to which we shall presently come, a wheel is figured on one of the towers, as an indication of building in progress. He also made the stone screens which, till a hundred years ago, enclosed the chapel, probably of St. Christopher, under the north-west tower.

Digitized by Google

But the west end of the church was destined to remain unfinished, and the King's attention was absorbed in his magnificent scheme for the rebuilding of the Lady Chapel. In February and March 1498, Fascet the Prior and Islip the Monk Bailey had represented the dying Abbot in the controversy between Chertsey, Windsor, and Westminster, as to the final resting-place of King Henry VI. The new work at Windsor was already set on foot, but when Westminster obtained the verdict, the King at once decided to erect a new Lady Chapel at the Abbey. On January 24, 1503, the Abbot and others, on the King's behalf, laid the first stone of the new building. Large sums were intrusted to Islip, and the work was pushed rapidly forward. Lady Margaret, the King's mother, undertook the furnishing and endowment of a chantry in the south aisle of the new chapel, and already before her death, which followed the King's in 1509, Masses were being said there by Thomas Elfride and others of the monks.

In two other parts of the Abbey, building was going forward under Abbot Islip. More than a century before, Litlington had completely rebuilt the Abbot's House, including the Hall and the Jerusalem Chamber. The latter was connected with the southern portion of the house by a long gallery. For that part of the gallery which crossed the south base of the south-west tower Islip now substituted a building of two stories and a ground floor; and at the back of it he made an oratory with an oriel window opening on the nave of the church. It would seem that this was 'my Lord's new chapel,' which now comes to be mentioned in the Sub-sacrist's accounts side by side with the 'Jesus Chapel.'

This Jesus Chapel has set a problem to the antiquaries on which they have expended some mistaken ingenuity. They have known it hitherto only from an inventory made at the Suppression. Citing inaccurately the language of this inventory, and interpreting it by statements drawn from the Customary of the thirteenth century and from the 'Rites of Durham,' they have started a tradition (which has already found its way into the guide books) of a 'Jesus

Digitized by Google

altar below' in the nave, and a 'Jesus altar above' in the loft between the nave and the choir. As the whole question of 'Jesus mass' and 'Jesus anthem' is still under discussion among liturgiologists, it may be worth while to state the pertinent facts as regards the church of Westminster.

We must premise that the new devotion in question became exceedingly popular in England in the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. This can be shewn for parish churches in the country by many churchwardens' accounts. In the cathedrals and other great churches, it was not uncommon for benefactors to provide for a 'Jesus mass' to be sung every Friday in the year, and sometimes for a 'Jesus anthem' also to be sung after Compline on the same days.[1] At Lincoln the Jesus mass was sung with organ accompaniment before a crucifix on the south side of the church (c. 1514–1536). At Lichfield some twenty years earlier there was a provision for both mass and anthem. There was a like provision at Durham, c. 1515; and in the 'Rites of Durham,' we have an elaborate description of a 'Jesus altar' within a wainscot 'closett or porch' in the midst of the nave under the great Rood; moreover, 'there was on the north syde betwixt two pillers a looft for the m^r and quiresters to sing Jesus mass every fridaie, conteyninge a paire of orgaines to play on' (pp. 32 *sqq.*).

At Westminster there appears to be no mention of a 'Jesus altar,' but there was a 'Jesus chapel.' In one of the Suppression Inventories, printed by Walcott in the *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archæological Society* for August, 1873, we have the record of the furniture of a long list of chapels. After those of St. John Evangelist and St. John Baptist, and before that of St. Paul, comes the Jesus chapel.

Its contents are described under two headings: *Jhesus Chapell benneth* and *Jhesus Chapell above*. Walcott appends the note: 'This is clearly Abbot Islip's chantry'; and it is strange that his judgement should ever have been disputed.

[1] See the notes in the new edition of the *Rites of Durham* (Surtees Society, 1903), pp. 220 *sqq.*

Digitized by Google

Islip's chantry, with its upper and lower compartments, is in the neighbourhood in question, the order of the chapels being, in fact—St. John Evangelist, Islip's chantry, St. John Baptist, and St. Paul.

Moreover, the commissioners found in the lower compartment of the Jesus chapel 'a ffront for the nether of the auter of rede and whit damaske with Abbott Islyp's armys'; and in the upper 'another ffront for the auter of rede and whit damaske with armys of abot Yslip,' and 'an upper front of whit and rede damaske with a Crucyffix Mary and John, with Jhus and Abbott Yslips Armys all in brothered.' The symbols of Abbot Islip on both the altars naturally suggest that this Jesus chapel was his chantry; and the next chapel, that of St. Paul, offers an exact parallel; for there were 'my lord Dawbiney's Arms in broderyd' on the upper front of the altar before which lies Giles Lord Daubeny.

Again, in the 'Jesus chapel above' there stood 'a payer of Organys with a corten of lynen cloth to cover them.' This was for the musical accompaniment of the Jesus mass or anthem. The same inventory begins by mentioning 'ii payre of organes in the quyre.' It is of interest to note that in the early years of Queen Elizabeth, a quarter of a century afterwards, there were not only 'the great wooden organs in the loft' over the quire, but also organs in King Henry the Seventh's Chapel, used for the early morning service; probably Islip's organ had been moved to serve this new purpose.

We know from the Islip Roll and from Weever's description that the Crucifixion was depicted above the altars of Islip's chantry, and this accords with its use as a Jesus chapel. And, as if to crown the proof of identity, there still remains carved in stone above the doorway of Islip's chantry the symbol IHS. This symbol, as we have seen, was powdered together with 'Yslips Armys' on the red and white damask of the altar front; but it is not common in the Abbey church, if indeed it occurs at all except in modern work.

A word must be said as to the mistake which in recent times has imagined a 'Jesus altar' in the nave. It appears

Digitized by Google

to be founded partly on the 'Rites of Durham' and partly on a passage in Abbot Ware's Customary, which says that the Sacrist is bound to find five lamps to burn ceaselessly day and night in the church, according to right and ancient custom: one before the altar of Holy Cross in the nave; another before St. Paul's altar and the figure of the Crucified, to which figure the people go up by steps on one side and down on the other to kiss its feet; the third before the old altar of the Blessed Mary; the fourth before that of the Trinity; and the fifth before that of St. Benedict.

The Customary dates from 1266, though it has insertions here and there as late as 1273. The new Choir began to be used in 1269, but the Lady Chapel had been finished long before. The custom here described refers to altars in the Norman nave, the 'old altar' of St. Mary being that which had been superseded by the Lady Chapel. These facts must be borne in mind when we come to make conjectures as to the position of the five altars which had lamps perpetually burning before them. The altar of Holy Cross, which had a candle in a basin beneath its lamp, to be lighted on festivals and whenever the 'greater mass' was sung, was plainly the principal altar at the east end of the nave, and before the wall which blocked off the new work of the Choir. But we must not assume that above it was a great Roodloft with two staircases and an altar at the top. Where St. Paul's altar and the Crucifix stood, we cannot tell: it is not necessary to imagine a loft at all: a few steps may have led to a platform from which the feet of the Crucifix could be kissed, as it hung between two pillars. We have nothing to help us to place the other three altars. Especially must we beware of arguing from this ancient arrangement to the state of things at the beginning of the sixteenth century, when the new devotion of the 'Jesus mass' had come to require a place in the completed church.[1]

If any doubt be thought to remain as to the identifica-

[1] The view contested here is set forth in brief by Mr. Micklethwaite in Miss Bradley's (Mrs. Murray Smith's) *Annals of Westminster Abbey*, 1898, p. 390; and it has been developed somewhat unfortunately by Mr. Lethaby in *Westminster Abbey and its Craftsmen*, 1906, p. 26.

Digitized by Google

tion of Islip's chapel with the Jesus chapel, it may be set at rest by a bill of 1530, from which some part may be quoted:

'Payementes made by thandes of Dan John Fulwell at the commaundement of my lord of Westm^{r} as hereafter ensewyth.

Fyrst payed to master humfrey for the last payement of his bargeyn for payntyng uppon the wall in Ihs Chappell, with vii^{s} vi^{d} for hys reward . . . vi^{li} x^{d}

Item payed for ii payer of candelstykkes one for the Ihs chappell and the other for my lordes chapell at chenygates . . . viii^{s}

'Item payed to John Ellys for makyng of the V woondes over the stayre at Ihs chappell in gret . . . iii^{s} iiii^{d}

'Item payed to master humfrey for payntyng of the same in gret . . . v^{s}

'Item payed to Antony newman for mendyng of the organs in Ihs Chappell in gret . . . xv^{s}.'

It appears from this account that the decoration of Islip's chapel was not completed until two years before his death. Mr. Lethaby will forgive our criticizing his attribution of its locality in return for the name of a new master painter.

From this digression we must return to Abbot Islip. We have used his name to shew by an example that much remains to be written of the history of Westminster Abbey; and the illustration would be far from complete if we did not refer to the notable documents which tell the story of his funeral. The first of these is a full description in English of the ceremonial of his interment. The Abbot died at his manor house of Neyte, on Sunday, May 12, 1532. He lay in state till Thursday afternoon, when all his monks and the Abbot of Bury brought him in procession to Westminster. The procession, which is elaborately described, included Richmond and Lancaster Heralds, and was followed by so many of the Westminster folk, that it extended all the way from Neyte to Tothill Street. When they came into the choir, the body 'was set under a goodly herse' with lights and banners and scutcheons.

'Then Dirige began, solemnly sung by the said monastery, and divers Dirige's done in other places of the church; which

Digitized by Google

being done with the other ceremonies, the morners with thother departid unto a place over the Chappell of the defuncte, where was prepared for them spiced breade, suckett, marmylate, spiced plate, and dyversse sourts of Wines plentie. And in the meane ceason they of the Churche did burye the defuncte in the seid Chappell of his buyldynge. . . . Then in the choir underneath the herse was made a presentation of the corps covered with a cloth of gold of tyshew . . . which being done every man departed for that night.'

The next day two masses were sung—the Mass of our Lady and the Mass of the Trinity—with offerings at each from the mourners. After refreshment came the Mass of Requiem, sung by the Abbot of Bury *in pontificalibus*. A great dole was given to the poor, and the mourners dined in the manor-place.[1] The herse remained 'until the month's mynde.'

After this almost regal pomp of burial, we can readily understand that the Brief, in which the Abbot's decease was to be announced to other monasteries, should be of more than usual splendour. With this intention an artist of the first rank was secured—some, indeed, have declared that it must have Holbein himself. The outline sketch of a series of exquisite pictures alone remains to bear witness to the insecurity of ecclesiastical institutions in the period which immediately followed Islip's death. The famous Islip Roll was never completed. Its later history is a curious one. Where it was for two centuries and a half we cannot tell, nor how it became possible for a certain prebendary named Drummond to present it to the Chapter Library in 1747.[2] How it left the Library we have lately

[1] That is to say, the manor of Cheynegates, as the Abbot's House was called. The document quoted above is printed by Widmore (pp. 206–210): misled by the statement which heads it, to the effect that the Abbot died at Westminster, he prints unintelligibly 'from next,' instead of 'from Neyt,' in his account of the length of the procession.

[2] Robert Hay, who afterwards took the name of Drummond, was son of Lord Kinnoull. At six years of age he was brought to Westminster School by Matthew Prior and entered under Dr. Freind. Some years later, while he was playing in *Julius Caesar* before King George II. and Queen Caroline, his ostrich plumes caught fire, but he courageously went on with his part. He was Prebendary of Westminster from 1743–

Digitized by Google

learned from Mr. St. John Hope, who discovered that it was lent to the Society of Antiquaries by Dean Thomas in 1791. The Dean gave permission for the reproduction of the drawings, and died in 1793, leaving no record of the loan. A reproduction was made in 1807, but the roll remained with the Antiquaries. Under the editorship of Mr. Hope the Society published a more accurate facsimile in 1906. Shortly before its issue, the Dean and Chapter had become aware from an old book of donations to the Library that the roll had once been theirs. At a special meeting of the Society of Antiquaries, held in the old Abbot's Hall on January 31, 1907, the precious roll was restored with friendly courtesy to the Dean and Chapter. Its pictures are of great merit in themselves, and are a valuable record of many details of the church and its ornaments. The letter-press which now accompanies their reproduction gives an excellent account of the *brevicula* in which the prayers of other communities were desired for brethren deceased.

Thus the official career of the last great Abbot of Westminster—perhaps the greatest of his line—is illustrated at its opening and its close by a unique series of documents. Of his private life we shall never perhaps know more than is told us by a recurring item in his accounts, which shews that he was contributing to the maintenance of his sister. But of the fortunes of the abbey under Islip's administration much remains to be written—from its enrichment out of the smaller priories in King Henry VII.'s will to the unfair exchanges of Islip's last years, by which the greed of King Henry VIII. took St. James's Park and other valuable properties at Westminster, giving in return lands held by the Carthusians of Mount Grace, and by other houses whose downfall presaged the general pillage. Wolsey's visitation, arranged, postponed, and ultimately held, cost money; Cromwell in his turn had to be paid. When Islip lay dying,

1748, then Bishop of St. Asaph for twelve years, and afterwards Archbishop of York and Lord High Almoner to the King. Before he left Westminster he gave to the Chapter Library 'a Drawing on Vellum representing various Things relating to Abbot Islip.'

Digitized by Google

the deluge had begun: Katharine was already banished from the palace: the King had claimed the Headship of the Church. The day before Islip's funeral, Convocation had been forced to make the declaration known as the Submission of the Clergy; on the day on which he was borne in procession to his grave, the King received back the Great Seal from Sir Thomas More. Fitly does Stanley remark that as we look upon the pageant of the Islip Roll 'we seem to be following to their end the funeral of the Middle Ages.'

His successor, a monk of Peterborough, was the first Abbot for three hundred years who was not a son of the house. It is suspected that he bought his place from Cromwell; at any rate, he was ready, when the time came, to make the great surrender. The last flash of the glory of Benedictine Westminster had been seen at Islip's funeral. The monastery fell for no positive sins of its own: not a breath of scandal seems to have touched it; Islip and his monks, for aught we know, were as respectable as any Dean and his prebendaries since.

Indeed, the fall was the softest possible. The Abbot became the Dean; the Prior and five monks made up half the number of the new prebendaries, and other monks held minor posts in the new foundation. The old ritual remained, though the services were curtailed: the masses were but three each day, and—what must have grated on the old Westminster sentiment—the ordinary for the first ten years was a bishop. The Abbey church had become for the nonce the cathedral of a new diocese; singing men and children were provided for, and the monastic school became the cathedral grammar-school. It was the next reign that brought devastation.

Before an adequate history of the Black Monks of Westminster can be written, there is much preliminary work to be done. It is strange that Flete's *History* should never have been printed. John Flete was Prior in 1456. His book is to a great extent a compilation, with large extracts from royal charters and papal bulls. He has written somewhat sparse and disappointing Lives of the Abbots as far as Litlington, transcribing at tedious length

Digitized by Google

the documents relating to their anniversaries. He makes a quaint digression to describe the yearly tribute of salmon, and the controversies that arose concerning it; and he has a long chapter on the Abbey relics and their donors. The manuscript lies in the Chapter Library, and was used by Dart and, more scientifically, by Widmore. Its first editor would have to take account of a manuscript in the Cottonian collection at the British Museum, written by a later monk, Richard Sporley, who for the most part only copied Flete.

There are several Chartularies, some in the Muniment Room and some in the British Museum, which need to be systematically described. They overlap a good deal, and many of the documents contained in them are copies of which the originals are preserved; but there is much interesting matter hidden away in them. The most valuable book of this class is called the *Liber Niger Quaternus*, and is often quoted by Widmore: the largest was in Dean Goodman's time referred to as 'Domesday,' a name which was also given to a similar book at St. Paul's. Besides these there is a series of Registers, beginning with King Henry VII.'s reign, which contain copies of leases and other documents which passed the seal.

A vast mass of records relates to the Abbey estates, and among these are found in some instances all the 'evidences' of smaller monastic houses, such as Hurley Priory, whose lands came to the Abbey at their suppression. Incidental information as to Westminster is often to be gathered from these sources. But far more directly important are the rolls of the Sacrists and of the many other officials of the monastery, and the fabric rolls of the *novum opus*. And then there is the multitude of scattered documents, letters, protests, bills, &c., which cannot be made properly available until Dr. Scott's index is completed.

A series of monographs should precede any further attempt to write the history of the Abbey of Westminster. Such a series might contain an edition of the principal royal charters, an edition of Flete, a study of the Sacrists' rolls, and another of the fabric rolls, essays on the chief monastic buildings, on the topography of the precincts,

Digitized by Google

and of Westminster outside the precincts—these last to be based mainly on a minute examination of the leases. Work of this kind is laborious, and when it is done, it appeals but to very few. Still no labour can be thrown away which helps to illustrate an institution which lies so near to the heart of English life; nor, again, will it be possible to write the history of Benedictine monasticism in England until Westminster has made its necessary contribution.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

ART. IV.—THE CHURCH OF DENMARK.

1. *Den nordiske Kirkes Grundlæggelse.* By A. D. JÖRGENSEN. (Copenhagen, 1874–78.)
2. *Den angelsachsiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den norske.* By A. TARANGER. (Christiania, 1890.)
3. *Fra Grundtvigianismus og den Indre Missions Tid.* By L. KOCH. (Copenhagen, 1898.)
4. *Halvgrundtvigianismen eller Bogstavdyrkelsen.* By C. H. SCHARLING. (Copenhagen, 1893.)

and many other works.

BEDE'S well-known statement according to which the home of the English before they settled in Britain was in Sleswick seems to be open to some doubt; but at any rate the English and the Danes were kindred peoples. Before the viking ages there were also peaceful relations and even a kind of literary intercourse between them, and after the invasions of the Danes in England the relations were not altogether hostile. The languages of the two nations were so much alike that an Englishman would have no great difficulty in understanding a viking.[1]

Historians have made full investigations of the early sojournings of the Danes in England, and philologists have shewn that the language of the settlers has had a lasting effect upon that of the natives. Unfortunately, there has

[1] Otto Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language* (Williams & Norgate, 1905), p. 60 *sqq.*

Digitized by Google

not been so much attention paid to the relations of the two national Churches. It is true there is no question of a continuous spiritual intercourse except in that period of intermingling of the two nations, but those very beginnings are of considerable interest. And the student who tries to trace further through the subsequent centuries any evidence of communication between the Churches finds now and then points of contact some of which, however slight they may be in themselves, bear witness to a spiritual relationship corresponding to that of blood.

Christianity was originally introduced into Denmark from Germany, but it is now becoming more and more clear that the Church of England too shared very largely in the foundation and organization of the Danish Church. The strong influence of the neighbouring country towards the south dates from a later time; during the first two or three centuries the English influence seems to have been paramount. It appears from a very able book by Mr. (now Professor) A. Taranger of Christiania that the Church in Norway was a daughter of that in England and in its laws and customs modelled after the pattern of the mother Church.[1] Even though in the case of Denmark the relations were not exactly the same from the beginning, yet they appear soon to have become so. Some few years ago the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences proposed the subject for a prize essay. Not having been answered the question has been put out a second time, and the prize gained by a Danish lady, Miss E. S. R. Jörgensen. It is to be hoped that one day such sources as are available, scanty as they are indeed, may be published. Here we propose to give only a few hints for which we are indebted to modern writers.

When the Christian faith was first preached in Denmark by Ansgar, 'the Apostle of the North,' more than two hundred years had elapsed since the foundation of the see

[1] *Den angelsachsiske Kirkes Indflydelse paa den norske* (Kristiania, 1890). On broader lines the history of the Church in Norway down to the Reformation has been written in English by Mr. T. B. Willson—*History of the Church and State in Norway, from the Tenth to the Sixteenth Century.* (Constable: 1903).

Digitized by Google

of Canterbury. Thus the heathen vikings who crossed the North Sea came to a Christian country, to the Church of which their invasions were a very sore trial. In their ravagings and plunderings they destroyed the churches and monasteries, and disorganized the congregations; episcopal sees remained vacant, and in some cases bishoprics were not revived.[1] Most of the religious houses that had become parochial rectories were ruined, the greater houses were not at once re-occupied on the restoration of order, and most of the smaller houses disappeared.[2]

> 'But gospel truth is potent to allay
> Fierceness and rage; and soon the cruel Dane
> Feels, through the influence of her gentle reign,
> His native superstitions melt away.'

In these lines, which a Danish lover of Wordsworth does not easily forget, the poet has depicted the noble revenge taken by the English. After their settlement the invaders, throughout the whole Danelaw, were Christianized, and in the tenth century gave three archbishops to the English Church.[3] But Danes were not found in the Danelaw only; there were some of them also among the men around the kings. Thus it was the Danish chancellor Thorketel who accompanied the daughters of King Edward to Germany that Otto the Great might choose one of them for his wife.[4] After that time there was a numerous population of converted Danes in England, but many of them returned to their fatherland carrying with them the faith they had adopted abroad, and in this way the formative period in the history of the newly-founded Church in Denmark came to reflect the Christian civilization of England.

The English influence, of course, reached its summit in the reign of Cnut. Englishmen were instrumental in

[1] Hunt, *The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*, p. 247.

[2] Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages in England*, p. 37.

[3] Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 267.

[4] A. D. Jörgensen, *Den nordiske Kirkes Grundlæggelse* (Copenhagen, 1874-78), p. 187.

Digitized by Google

completing the conversion of the people and organizing the Church among them. It seems that Cnut even made an attempt to give the see of Canterbury a certain superiority over the Danish bishops. It is a fact, at least, that he caused Archbishop Ethelnoth to consecrate three bishops, obviously of Danish origin, for the dioceses of Scania, Sealand, and Fuenen. This greatly displeased Unwan, the Archbishop of Bremen, who claimed to be Metropolitan of the Scandinavian countries; he caught the new Bishop of Roskilde in Sealand at sea, forced him to make a profession of obedience, and wrote to Cnut complaining of the infringement of his rights; and the King promised that he would respect them in future.[1] During the reign of Cnut the Church in Denmark made considerable progress in its internal organization, no doubt owing in an extraordinary degree to tendencies originating in the older and far more advanced national Church which had become its model. From the country he delighted to call his second home Cnut sent many bishops and priests to Denmark. Very likely most of them were Danes by birth, but they were trained in England.[2] The little that is known about the Church life in Denmark in those times suggests that it was an English growth in Danish soil or, at least, was quickened by zealous Englishmen and Anglo-Danes. The Danish Church had come into touch with influences which imparted to it a culture that it would not otherwise have attained so soon. During the reigns of Svend Estridsen (1047–1076) and his sons and followers the Church was prospering; new bishoprics were erected and churches of stone were built, among others Roskilde Cathedral. When the first great monastery was founded, in Odense (in Fuenen) by Eric the Good-natured (1095–1103), he invited monks from Eovesham to come over to Denmark; not a few obeyed the call, and for a long while an active communication continued between the two monasteries.[3] Those English monks had a considerable part in the creation of Christian culture in Denmark. It is therefore very characteristic

[1] Hunt, *op. cit.* p. 397. [2] A. D. Jörgensen, *op. cit.* p. 447.
[3] Professor Johannes Steenstrup in *Dansk Tidsskrift*, 1898, p. 159.

Digitized by Google

that, when literary activity began in this country, the first Lives of the Saints were committed to writing not by Germans but by Englishmen. Archbishop Ethelnoth related at great length the history of St. Cnut, and likewise Robert of Ely that of Cnut Lavard (Lord). Here it may also be mentioned that certain circumstances go to indicate that the Church in Aarhus, in Jutland, which was dedicated to the Holy Trinity, had some connexion with Winchester Cathedral.[1]

From the beginning of the twelfth century the German influence was gaining ascendency in Denmark. The current of English Church life had slackened, yet not ceased; we still meet with an English name now and then in the annals of the Danish Church. The instances recorded are few indeed and far between, but all the more worthy of note. Down to the twelfth century the Danish bishops remained suffragans of the Archbishop of Bremen. It was not until 1104 that the see of Lund, in Scania, was raised to metropolitan rank with jurisdiction over all the Scandinavian countries; and it was only in 1152 that the famous mission took place of the Cardinal Albino, the Englishman Breakspear (afterwards Pope Adrian IV.), which gave to the northern churches their permanent character.[2]

In the thirteenth century the great religious movement caused by the Franciscans found its way to Denmark from Germany, the friars who first crossed the border of the country coming from Thuringia. But as an indication of the still lingering English sway we may notice the interesting statement that from the Northern countries repeated applications were made for English friars, and that on one occasion Bishop Grosseteste endeavoured to bring about a mission of Franciscans to Denmark.[3]

During the closing centuries of the Middle Ages the Church in Denmark became more and more uniform with the ecclesiastical system which prevailed throughout Western Christendom; but there is nothing in its history

[1] A. D. Jörgensen, *op. cit.* pp. 202 *sq.*, 338.
[2] *The Cambridge Modern History*, ii. p. 601.
[3] F. S. Stevenson, *Robert Grosseteste*, pp. 75, 82.

Digitized by Google

in those times to suggest any close relation with the English Church. Danish ecclesiastics studied in Paris and elsewhere on the Continent—down to the Reformation, as a rule, the higher clergy in Denmark were trained abroad—but not in Oxford, and the great English schoolmen of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries did not exercise any direct influence in Denmark, if any at all; neither were the ideas of Wycliffe propagated in that country. The next landmark is the turning-point of the sixteenth century: the Reformation, although it caused a division of the two countries, reveals some points of unity in diversity by which the intercourse of modern times is rendered possible.

When we pass over to the Reformation epoch, it must be admitted at once that there was scarcely any intellectual or spiritual intercourse worth mentioning between the two nations at the time; but, however diverse in their character, the simultaneous religious movements were inter-related to some extent, that in Denmark being entirely due to the Lutheran revival, that in England being not entirely independent of it. The influence of Lutheranism upon the English Reformation in its first stage is pointed out by a learned Church historian of the seventeenth century, L. Seckendorf.[1] In his Bampton Lectures for 1804 Archbishop Laurence says: 'On the whole [therefore] the principles upon which our Reformation was conducted ought not to remain in doubt: they were essentially Lutheran.'[2] Evidences are also given by several more recent historians such as Ranke, Froude, Blunt, and Dixon. During the sixteenth century over and over again the Anglicans were inclined to join the Lutherans in Germany.

'In Henry VIII.'s time, in 1533, and again in 1535, overtures were made for a Fœdus Evangelicum, a league of the great reforming nations. The differences between the German and the English Protestants were at that time very great, not only in details of discipline and government, but in the general spirit

[1] *Commentarius historicus et apologeticus de Lutheranismo* (1692, fol.) Lib. iii. sect. 13, xxxix.; sect. 17, lxvi.

[2] *An Attempt to illustrate those Articles of the Church of England which the Calvinists improperly consider as Calvinistical* (1805), p. 25.

Digitized by Google

in which the Reformation in the two countries was being conducted. But an alliance of the kind contemplated would perhaps have been carried out had it not been for the bigotry which insisted upon signature of the Augsburg Confession. Queen Elizabeth was at one time inclined to join on behalf of England the Smalcaldic League of German Protestants, but the same obstacle intervened.' [1]

And *vice versa*, while they kept aloof from English Presbyterians, the Lutherans in Germany approached the Anglicans.

'As between England and Germany, one great impediment to a cordial understanding arose out of the differences between Lutheran and Reformed. So long as the English Church was under the guidance of Cranmer and Ridley, it was not clear to which of these two parties it most nearly approximated. In the reign of Edward VI. the Calvinistic element gained ground—a tendency as much resented by the one party abroad as it was welcomed by the other. The English clergymen who found a refuge in the Swiss and German cities were treated with marked neglect by the Lutherans, but received with great hospitality by the Calvinists. At a later period, when Presbyterianism had for the time gained strong ground in England, the attitude had become somewhat reversed. The Reformed or Calvinist section of German Protestants sided chiefly with Presbyterians, the Lutherans with the English Churchmen.' [2]

This attitude of the Lutherans was very natural, as they really did steer a course approaching the *via media* of the English Church, in the Scandinavian countries even more than in Germany. It is true that at the time of the Reformation there was no corporate alliance between the Church of England and that of Denmark, but on neither side did any prejudice exist against associating one with the other, as is exemplified by the following instances. In the British Museum is found a copy of the 'Ordinantia Ecclesiastica Regnorum Daniae et Norwegiae, 1537,' dedicated to Henry VIII. by Bugenhagen [3]; we are hereby reminded of the well-

[1] Abbey and Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, i. p. 367.

[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Kirkehistoriske Samlinger*, V. Series, vol. i. p. 335.

Digitized by Google

known fact that in the following year some Lutherans from Germany were invited to England by the King, in order to join the Anglican divines who had to draw up a confession of faith, the outcome being the Thirteen Articles of 1538. A young Danish scholar, Hans Oldendorph, was an amanuensis to Archbishop Cranmer, 1549–1550, and returned to his native country only because of a mental disease and dislike of the Calvinism then prevailing among the English Reformers.[1] Another member of the University of Copenhagen, Johan Spithoff (Johannes Spithovius), a German by birth, was tutor to Princess (afterwards Queen) Elizabeth.[2] The Scotchman, John MacAlpine, who had studied in England, became Professor of Divinity in the University of Copenhagen, here called Johannes Machabæus Alpinus;[3] and after having arrived in Copenhagen in 1555 his brother-in-law, Bishop Miles Coverdale, was offered preferment in Denmark which he declined only because he failed to master the Danish language, going thereafter to Germany and later returning to England.[4]

It is beyond all denial that the final Reformation settlement in England has a character of its own; but it is equally certain that Lutheranism is much more conservative than Calvinism, and the Churches of Scandinavia especially are possessed of a respect for tradition which has traits in common with the principles of reformed Catholicism as advocated by the Church of England. Without attempting to give an exhaustive account of resemblances and differences between the English and the Danish Churches, we think it worth while to point out the features of unity underlying the manifold diversity, and it may be convenient to group the details under the following three heads.

In the first place, there is an unquestionable analogy

[1] H. F. Rördam, *Kjöbenhavns Universitets Historie*, 1537–1621, vol. i. p. 600.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 599 *sq.* [3] *Ibid.* p. 587 *sq.*

[4] *Ibid.* p. 593 *sq.* The literary product of his stay on the Continent was: *The Order of the Church of Denmark, and in many Places of Germany, for the Lord's Supper, Baptism, and Holy Wedlock*, in *Writings and Translations of Myles Coverdale*, ed. by G. Pearson (Parker Society), pp. 467 *ff.*

Digitized by Google

between the two Churches as viewed under a doctrinal aspect, the connecting link being the Thirteen Articles of 1538, through which as a medium the Augsburg Confession influenced the Thirty-two Articles from which the Thirty-nine are descended. The matter has been expounded in his Bampton Lectures by Archbishop Laurence and in all elaborate commentaries on the Articles which have seen the light since, such as those by Hardwick and Dr. Gibson, now Bishop of Gloucester. In some passages the similarity is obvious, but, as Dr. Gibson has it, the debt of the Articles to Lutheranism is but a limited one.

'On the burning question of justification' (says the Bishop), 'and all kindred subjects, where correspondence might well be looked for, it is remarkable that it is sought in vain. On all these topics, which were among the principal subjects of debate in the early days of the Reformation—questions which concern the condition of man, and the means of his salvation—our reformers took an independent line of their own, which differs in a very marked way from the line taken at Augsburg. Nor should it be forgotten that in some of the matters in which indebtedness to the Lutheran formulary cannot be denied, the Anglican statements are far stronger and more precise than those to which the Lutherans were called on to subscribe.' [1]

We should hesitate to say anything in the way of criticism against what the Bishop has alleged on the relations of the two documents, although we are not certain that full justice is done to the Augsburg Confession; but, when full allowance is made for the undeniable differences, we should, on the other hand, be no less indisposed to emphasize these at the sacrifice of the underlying correspondence. In support of our proposition we only suggest a comparison between the two formularies on one side and the Calvinistic confessions on the other. It would seem to us that over against the latter there is an essential accordance between the former, and we think this holds good especially in the doctrine of the sacraments. In contradistinction to the 'reformed' confessions the two formularies belong to the same doctrinal type, the differences being but varying

[1] Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 26 *sq.*

Digitized by Google

shades of the same tenets or even, in some cases, the merest shadows of shades.

Secondly, as regards the liturgy and ritual there is no discrepancy in principle between the two Churches. The very fact that the compilers of the English Prayer-Book made use of Lutheran orders of service goes to indicate an historical connexion in this respect no less interesting than that in doctrine. Certainly, the service of the Danish Church is very poor in comparison with the rich liturgy of the English Church, but here also the contrast with the service of the 'reformed' Churches is very suggestive. Fundamentally the Lutheran order of service is more divergent from the Calvinistic than from the Anglican ideal. While the Calvinists have cast away all usages which are not expressly sanctioned by Scripture, the Lutherans as well as the Anglicans have retained later practices so far as they are not incompatible with primitive Christianity. The difference between the Church of England and that of Denmark in ritual is only one of degree, not of principle. English churchmen travelling in Denmark usually find the service of the national Church nearer related to the Anglican forms than they expected it to be. We may refer here to the testimonies of two English clergymen who have visited that country. One of them says:

'Many of the English people who now resort to Scandinavia in the summer must be struck, when they first spend a Sunday there, with what they find in the native churches. They see crucifixes and elaborate reredoses—often dating from the Middle Ages, and "idolatrous" beyond anything that St. Paul's has ever been accused of; they see the vestments worn, candles lighted, wafers used. The service is called by the name of "High Mass," the officiating minister the "priest." He sings the office to regular (though not Gregorian) modes; he absolves each intending communicant singly before the service begins with imposition of hands; he blesses the people with the sign of the cross. When service is over he departs through the streets in his comely cassock, with its picturesque sixteenth-century ruff.'[1]

[1] *C.Q.R.* April 1891, p. 149 *sq.*

Digitized by Google

Dr. A. J. Mason, after a second visit to Denmark, recorded one of his experiences in the following words:

'Last year, by permission of the venerable Bishop of Aarhus, I celebrated the Holy Eucharist for an English congregation at the magnificent high altar of Aarhus Cathedral, in the ancient ecclesiastical vesture which is still retained there, and with their own beautiful sacred vessels. I long for the day when it may be possible for these exceptional courtesies to pass into the fulness of fraternal communion.' [1]

Another English churchman, the Rev. G. C. Richards, of Oriel College, thus states his very similar impressions:

'To those who think of Lutheranism as very "Protestant" it will be surprising to learn that Scandinavia is distinctly ritualistic. Its churches use four of the "six points." Incense and the mixed chalice are not found, but the eastward position, altar-lights, and wafer-breads are invariable. As a rule the officiating clergyman wears simply cassock and bands, but on festivals he celebrates with the chasuble over the surplice. . . . According to the Danish ritual law of 1688 the priest is ordered to wear every Sunday at High Mass the surplice and chasuble, and to remove the latter only when preaching. The crucifix has always been in common use in Denmark, though apparently not in Norway. . . . The sign of the cross is freely used, especially in giving the Benediction.' [2]

Observations like these serve to shew that the service of the Danish Church is akin to that of the Church of England. It might be urged that many individual members or even large sections of the Danish Church lay very little stress upon the ceremonies taken over from the Middle Ages or even regard some of them as obnoxious; but, on the other hand, the desire has sometimes been expressed for an enrichment of the service by adoption of more usages from the ancient liturgies.

As a correlative to the mention of the Danish service made by English clergymen might be quoted an utterance about the English liturgy by the present Bishop of Sea-

[1] *The Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity* (Longmans, 1896), p. 134.

[2] *The Guardian*, August 14, 1901. We have slightly abridged the passage quoted, but altered no words.

Digitized by Google

land, Dr. T. Skat Rördam, who in 1857 made a long stay in London to study Syriac manuscripts in the British Museum. Speaking of that visit to England, in a discussion on Prayers at a Church Congress in Copenhagen, in 1890, Dr. Rördam expressed himself in the following terms:

'I have seldom heard more tiresome sermons than there, mostly in the Established Church, long-winded, arguing lectures that were recited from the book. And yet, I think I hardly remember one single occasion when I left the service without having derived edification and blessing from it, just owing to the common prayers that were prescribed in the Liturgy, but in which the congregation, on the whole, heartily joined. What not least contributed toward this was that one knew what was the object of the prayer, especially when one knew in some measure these prayers by heart; they are pretty easily learnt. On the other hand, among the Dissenters, where the preaching generally was far more animated, I heard the most deterring examples of prayers offered *ex tempore* by the ministers.' [1]

Thirdly, we also find in the constitution of the Danish Church some points of contact with that of the Church of England. What has been said of the conservative spirit of Lutheranism proves true here too. The Churches of Scandinavia, as the correspondent of the *Guardian* admirably puts it, 'have never entirely lost the sense of historic continuity.' From Lutheran principles no argument can be derived against episcopacy, even though against its divine right. Luther would not have opposed the bishops if they had been 'veri episcopi.' [2] That, perhaps, may be brought to bear upon the Reformation in Denmark. While then the mass of the priests submitted to the new order of things and became ministers in the 'Evangelical Lutheran' Church, the bishops opposed the King, Christian III., and were 'pinioned,' to quote the word used by himself. In this way the episcopal succession was discontinued in Denmark.[3] A new Episcopacy was afterwards introduced,

[1] *Beretning om det fjerde kirkelige Möde* 14-16 *October* 1890 *i Kjöbenhavn*, p. 101 *sq.*

[2] *Art. Smalcald*, x. 2.

[3] See the article 'The Loss of the Succession in Denmark,' *C.Q.R.* April 1891, quoted above.

Digitized by Google

but neither then nor at any time later has it been considered requisite to restore the continuity. In acknowledging the Episcopate of Sweden and Denmark Bishop Bramhall most likely was not aware of the breach of the succession in the latter country;[1] while further, we may add what Dr. Mason says of the former: 'The Swedish Church has a personal succession of bishops, though theologically it may be doubted whether the formula used in the consecration is sufficient for the purpose.'[2] Yet the Danish Church has always maintained its Catholicity. The Reformation in Denmark was not the foundation of a new Church, but a readjustment of the national Church founded by the mission of Ansgar. The Danish Church claims to be a branch of the Catholic Church, having preserved its continuity as an organized society. And there can be little or no doubt that with its old dioceses and parishes, its two orders (of bishop and priest), its convocations and other ecclesiastical institutions, it is more closely related to the Church of England than to English Nonconformity.

If the analogies between the two Churches are so great it remains to consider the possibilities of a mutual intercourse in our own day. But when at present an inquiry arises about a closer union, a retrospective glance would seem to be appropriate, and therefore, before entering upon the question, we shall premise a short historical survey. During the intervening centuries the two Churches have been but rarely, and on a very small scale, in touch with one another; yet history shews that there has been a growing English influence upon the Church life in Denmark.

It has been mentioned that Queen Elizabeth contemplated an alliance with the Smalcaldic League, but was frustrated by the requirement of the signature of the Augsburg Confession. On the part of England the Subscription Act of 1571 was likely to be an obstacle to approaches of Lutherans. Otherwise, the differences between Anglicanism and Lutheranism were not very conspicuous. The views of most of the Elizabethan bishops seem to have

[1] *Typical Churchmen*, ed. by W. E. Collins, p. 112.
[2] *The Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity*, p. 133.

Digitized by Google

been distinctly Protestant [1]; the school which in the seventeenth century was to give full shape to the Anglican principles in their individual character was only beginning to make its influence felt.

During the reign of the Stuarts England had political relations with Denmark, and in that respect it was of no little consequence that King James I. was married to a Danish princess. It goes far to indicate a close friendship between the sovereigns of the two countries that Charles I. commissioned two Scots to visit the King of Denmark to urge him to send arms for 12,000 men, 24 cannon, 100,000*l.*, a fleet of ships of war, 3,000 German infantry and 1,000 horse.[2] But there was no intellectual intercourse at the time, or next to none. It was not till the reign of William III. that English thought began to influence the Danish literature, even though we meet with some few Danish students in Oxford already in the closing years of the Stuart times. When, in 1792, the young Professor of History in the University of Copenhagen, Frederik Sneedorff, was travelling in England, where he was killed by an accident near Manchester, he copied from the register of visitors of the Bodleian Library a list of more than eighty Danes (including Norwegians) who between 1682 and 1783 had had access to the Library.[3] Several of them in their after-lives became distinguished men, the most famous being Ludvig Holberg, dramatist, historian, and philosopher, the greatest of all Danish writers, who studied in England, chiefly in London and Oxford, 1706–1708, and was deeply imbued with the common sense of the English mind. All through the eighteenth century English philosophy and theology acted upon the religious thought in Denmark, and English works of fiction and poetry were translated or imitated.[4] Of those currents of ideas that

[1] See F. O. White, *Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops* (Skeffington & Son, 1898).

[2] Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, vol. i. p. 45.

[3] Frederik Sneedorff, *Samlede Skrifter*, vol. i. p. 521 *sq.*

[4] See Adolf Hansen, *Engelsk Indflydelse paa dansk Aandsliv og Literatur i det attende Aarhundrede, Dansk Tidsskrift*, 1906.

Digitized by Google

flowed into the general Danish literature a good deal might be said, but these need not detain us here, as we are only concerned with the relations of the Churches. But simultaneously with the philosophic and literary impulses from beyond the North Sea began that infusion of the religious zeal of the British race which constitutes one of the main characteristics of Danish Church life in our own day.

The Lutheran influence in England was strengthened by the marriage of Queen Anne with Prince George of Denmark; and the accession of the House of Hanover was followed by an active co-operation of English clergymen and Lutheran pastors in London. At that time the English Church evinced a strong tendency towards a union with the Protestant bodies on the Continent, a tendency that originated from the principles of the English Reformation, as we have seen already.

'From the very beginning of the Reformation it had been a vexed question how far the cause of the Reformed Church of England could be identified with that of other communions which had cast off the yoke of Rome. In dealing with this problem, a broad distinction had generally been made between Nonconformists at home and Protestant communities abroad. The relation of the English Church to Nonconformity may accordingly be considered separately. So long as it was a question of communion, more or less intimate, with foreign Churches, the intercourse was at all events not embarrassed with any difficulties about schism.' [1]

The prime mover in the endeavour for a closer union between the English Church and the Protestants on the Continent was Archbishop Wake.

'He desired to be on terms of cordial friendship with the Reformed Churches, notwithstanding their points of difference from that of England. He would wish they had a moderate episcopal government, according to the primitive model; nor did he yet despair of it, if not in his own time, perhaps in the days to come. He would welcome a closer union among all the Reformed bodies, at almost any price. The advantages he anticipated from such a result would be immense. Any

[1] Abbey and Overton, *op. cit.* p. 365.

Digitized by Google

approximations in Church government and Church offices which might conduce to it he should indeed rejoice in.' [1]

According to these views an Englishman who was not in his own day considered a Latitudinarian was of the opinion that members of the Church of Denmark would have no right to separate from their fellow-members on the plea that they liked the ways of the Church of England better.[2] It seems that Archbishop Wake corresponded with leading men of the Danish Church.[3] The S.P.C.K. supported the Danish mission in India, and on this matter, at least, letters are found among the Archbishop's papers. There was at the time no inconsiderable conflux of the religious life of England and Germany through the Lutherans and Moravians in London, and A. H. Franke in Halle was the intermediate link between the S.P.C.K. and the Danish 'Missions-Collegium,' which had the supervision of the missions. Philip Jacob Spener, the originator of the German Pietism, was deeply impressed in his youth by English devotional literature; in Denmark, as in Germany, such books were translated, but in both countries indiscriminately dissenting rather than Anglican productions. As the counterpart to this may be recalled the fact that John Wesley at the turning-point of his life received a very powerful impulse from Luther's exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.

During the nineteenth century there has been an ever increasing communication between England and Denmark. The commercial intercourse is of vital importance to either country, and in science, philosophy, and general literature the English influence is now very considerable in Denmark. At the same time the religious life in that country is affected by the impetus of English revivalism. Not a few clergymen and ordination candidates have gone to London in order to make themselves acquainted with the methods of mission work and charities. The Danish Bible Society, Missionary Society, Young Men's Christian Association, and

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 355. [2] *Ibid.* p. 366.
[3] Abbey, *The English Church and its Bishops*, 1700–1800, i. 98.

Digitized by Google

numerous other Christian efforts are organized and conducted more or less on the same lines as their English models. The book market is inundated by translations of English devotional books and religious tracts—again, as in the eighteenth century, the works of dissenting rather than of Anglican writers.

The same influence is conspicuous in the Protestant Churches in Germany; but the Danish soil seems to be particularly fitting for the English growths. Although the English sway has been of an excessively one-sided character, yet tendencies corresponding to those of the various sections of the English Church are, perhaps, more pronounced in Denmark than in any other country. Even the designations 'high,' 'low,' and 'broad' Church have of late come into frequent use in Denmark as hardly anywhere else outside England. It must, however, be noticed that the diverse currents are sometimes intermingled in a curious way so as to render an attempt to place the English and Danish Church parties side by side rather precarious.

Two parties have originated in the revival of the nineteenth century. The older are the Grundtvigianers, so called after N. F. S. Gruntdvig (b. 1783, d. 1872). He was a seer: his views were the intuitions and visions of a prophet. They sprang out of his personal experience, but were deeply tinged with the Romanticism of the age. As a preacher and a poet, an historian and a politician, a champion for national freedom and the founder of rural High Schools, he originated a movement which has been of very great significance in the development of the religious and national life in Denmark. The tendency is not purely religious, but patriotic and political as well. The Grundtvigianers look upon Christianity from an historico-poetical standpoint and aim at promoting everything which is truly humane; their view of life is bright and broad. Grundtvig's love of ecclesiastical antiquity led him into the study of ancient Church history and Old Northern literature. He was an admirer of the Anglo-Saxon poetry and translated Beowulf into Danish. He made four trips to England (1829, 1830, 1831, and 1843), and was for a while attracted by the

Digitized by Google

English Church; but it is perfectly clear that, whatever else England gave Grundtvig, it did not give him any deep and lasting sympathy with Anglican views. He had indeed some very pronounced sacramental views and thought highly of the primitive tradition; the centre of his teaching was his 'marvellous discovery,' as he called it, that the Creed is a word of the Lord Himself handed over from the Apostles to posterity. His followers sometimes call themselves 'the Church party' ('den kirkelige Retning'), which means 'the High Church party,' if it means anything. But, excepting the sacramental views, there is in the theology of Grundtvig and his school not the slightest tendency to High Church doctrine. In regard to Church offices and Holy Orders their views are distinctly Low; as to Church government their standpoint is the reverse of that commonly described as High Church. Being a democrat to the backbone, Grundtvig called the National Church 'a civil institution' ('en verdslig Indretning') which ought to embrace all religious denominations. Although this ecclesiastico-political view may remind one of Dr. Arnold's 'Principles of Church Reform,' it must be borne in mind that Grundtvig reached his conclusions from a somewhat different starting-point. In the first stage of its development Grundtvigianism met with very strong opposition, and, in order to ensure his own followers full liberty within the national Church, Grundtvig laid claim to full freedom for all parties alike. He advocated what he called 'Præstefrihed,' *i.e.* the pastors' liberty of preaching and administering the sacraments according to their own discretion. He was more inspired by English Nonconformity than by Anglicanism. A very suggestive characteristic of Grundtvigianism is the 'Elective Communities Act' of 1868, according to which a number of twenty persons, being the heads of a household, can form an elective community, building their own church and electing their own pastor, and yet being acknowledged as belonging to the Established Church. As there was in the party a tendency to separation in order to gain outside the pale of the Establishment the liberty they desired, the Act aims at being a safety-valve against disruption, and as such

Digitized by Google

it has been working well. Grundtvig's view of Church government has been discarded by many of his followers, but is still retained by others and even among the moderate men persists in a mitigated form. For the present there is a very marked difference between two currents, one of them tending to co-operation with the conservative party, the other to an extreme democratism.

The other section, of more recent origin, the 'Indre Mission' (Home Mission), was, as the name implies, originally intended to do a work, not to be a party; but they represent a very distinct tendency in Danish Church life. The movement is deeply indebted to the philosopher Sören Kierkegaard (b. 1813, d. 1855), a great dialectician and brilliant writer, but above all a profound religious thinker whose significance for the 'Indre Mission' has been a similar one to that of Alexandre Vinet for the 'Réveil' in Switzerland and France. But the one man who was its originator and moving force was Pastor Vilhelm Beck (b. 1829, d. 1901), a vigorous preacher and a man of great organizing powers. He travelled much in Denmark, preaching everywhere, and sent out lay preachers; throughout the country meeting-houses were built. The revival caused by Beck and his co-workers in some respects reminds one of the Methodist movement; but from the beginning it had a distinctly national character. Its adherents were conservative in doctrine and faithful to the principles of the national Church, words which will still apply to the older generation. The tendency had its roots in the pietism of the preceding ages, and, as the name was taken over from Germany, it has been largely affected by the evangelistic work in that country. But of late years many of the younger men have been instinct with the spirit of English and American revivalism. Such preachers as C. H. Spurgeon, Hugh Price Hughes, and Mr. F. B. Meyer have strongly appealed to those of them who have visited London. The Keswick movement has found a ready response among Danish students. Although the party generally hold fast to the doctrine of the Church, they sometimes shew a certain drift towards undenominationalism,

Digitized by Google

joining themselves freely with Evangelicals and Nonconformists alike.

The third section includes the rest of the Danish Church people. They are the conservatives, nowadays often called the 'High Church' party.[1] Comparatively they are 'High,' in so far as they maintain the principles and traditions of the national Church; but they have no leanings to distinct High Church views as advocated within the Church of England. They have much in common with orthodox Broad churchmen in England. They leave a wide scope for the free display of individualities, and thus we find within their ranks a variety of types of personalities and theological thinkers. A fairly good idea of the main characteristics of the school may be derived from the writings of the late Bishop of Sealand, Dr. H. L. Martensen (b. 1808, d. 1884), the friend and correspondent of J. A. Dorner. With a brilliant speculative power he endeavours to mediate between opposing extremes and to combine the interests of practical Church work with the pursuits of scientific theology. New currents of thought have set in, more realistic methods have sprung up, but the general character of the school, which has often been called after Martensen, is unchanged. Among them we are sure to find most of the men who appreciate learning, are interested in theological studies, and have a mind for literary culture and refinement. They have of late years frequently been characterized as the 'third' party as an indication of their being outsiders, belonging to neither of the two dominant parties; but having been compelled by these to organize themselves they have assumed the name of 'the centre.'

At one period (1848–1870) the Grundtvigianers had the ascendency, while in the following one the 'Indre Mission' has been predominant,[2] and the two parties have been so powerful as to throw the 'third' party into the shade. Grundtvigianism has leavened large sections of

[1] So also in the charming little book *Danish Life in Town and Country*, by Mrs. Jessie Bröchner (George Newnes), p. 23.

[2] L. Koch, *Fra Grundtvigianismens og den Indre Missions Tid*, 1848–1898 (Copenhagen, 1898).

Digitized by Google

the Church by overlapping to a certain extent the other tendencies and creating a wide-spread 'Half-Grundtvigianism.'[1] But if it must be admitted that the conservative party for two generations have been eclipsed by the combined forces of a twofold revival, it should not be forgotten that the background is the natural place for the section which is, after all, the backbone of the Church.

The present Church Reform movements in England and Denmark have shewn emphatically the deep-rooted differences between the two national Churches; but through the intricacies of conflicting opinions are faintly seen some parallel lines which betray the underlying analogies.

Until 1849 the Danish Church was absolutely governed by the State, but in that year King Frederic VII. signed a constitution, the 'Ground Law,' which was revised in 1866, and according to which the legislative rule is exercised conjointly by the King and the Parliament (the 'Rigsdag') consisting of an Upper House (the 'Landsthing') and a Lower House (the 'Folkething'). The 'Ground Law' marks a new departure in the history of the Danish Church. We may quote the principal paragraphs regarding the relations of Church and State: 'The Evangelical-Lutheran Church is the Danish National Church (Folkekirke) and is aided as such by the State.' 'The Constitution of the National Church shall be regulated by law.' The Church was to be governed by the Rigsdag only until it had got a constitution of its own; yet the promise contained in the latter paragraph has not been fulfilled till now. The work of a commission appointed in 1853 in order to prepare a constitution came to nothing, and a second one in 1868 had no better success. Several reforms were carried through by Acts of Parliament, *e.g.* a law on Release of the obligation of parishioners to use their own pastor, 1855, and the Elective Communities Act, 1868; but the Church is still governed by a minister and a parliament who are not bound to belong to it. For the present a new attempt is being made, and there is some prospect of the object being achieved. In

[1] C. H. Scharling, *Halvgrundtvigianismen eller Bogstavdyrkelsen* (Copenhagen, 1893).

Digitized by Google

July 1901 the first Liberal government was formed, and the new minister of ecclesiastical affairs and public education, Mr. J. C. Christensen (since 1904 premier), was anxious to ensure the fulfilment of the promise of the Ground Law. In 1903 three Bills were passed and sanctioned by the King, all of them being stepping-stones to the constitution to come.

The first of these laws enacted the formation of parochial church councils. The preceding debate in and outside the Houses of the Rigsdag presented an interesting parallel to the Church Reform movement which has been going on in England. It mainly turned upon the question of the lay franchise and the eligibility of laymen. How were the laity to be represented? Who were to be considered to be qualified to exercise a suffrage and to be eligible? Should baptism alone or confirmation or communion be the test? Should a declaration of being *bona fide* members of the Church be sufficient? Should women have a vote? What should be the office of the councils? By the law of 1903 parish councils were, by way of experiment, formed in all parishes for a period of six years, consisting of the pastor as chairman and at least four other members elected in the following way. Electors and eligible are men and women belonging to the parish, of the age of twenty-five and upwards, so far as they have not been convicted of any offence considered ignominious by public opinion, or led a scandalous life; besides this they have to ask that their names should be entered upon the roll of electors by filling up a form and signing a declaration, confessing thereby that they are baptized and members of the national Church and intend to retain their rights and duties as such. The councils are to have the control of several matters concerning the parish and its church. Of vital importance is the provision that, when a benefice is vacant, the council may be consulted on the appointment of a new pastor; since the law came into operation, the councils have usually been consulted, and they have very largely influenced the nomination of pastors.

The second law enacted the formation of a committee ('et kirkeligt Udvalg') to frame a constitution for the Church. It numbers thirty-seven members: four nominated by the

Digitized by Google

'Church minister'; the Bishop of Sealand; three other bishops chosen by the bishops as a body; eight pastors, one from Copenhagen elected by its clergy, seven elected by the clergy outside the capital; one professor of divinity and one professor of law selected by their respective faculties; eighteen laymen or women, three from Copenhagen, seven from the Isles, eight from Jutland; one member for the Færöer. Among the members there is one woman, a pastor's wife. The lay members are elected by representatives of the parish councils, according to the rules of proportional numbers.

The third law, 'On the Use of Churches,' supplements the Elective Communities Law by enacting that a number of not less than ten persons, being the heads of a household and belonging to the Church, shall have a right to use the parish church, at times when it is not used otherwise, for public services held by any pastor belonging to the Church. By this law the elective communities are relieved from the obligation to provide a church of their own.

The committee, who met for the first time in May 1904, have debated a great many questions of minor reforms, and in 1906 a sub-committee submitted a draft of a constitution. The final wording was adopted on October 31, 1906, by twenty-four votes to nine, and the Bill has been sent to the 'Church minister,' who is expected to introduce it in the Folkething next autumn. The time is not come to dilate on the scheme; we shall only make a few general remarks which will serve to lead us to a brief concluding survey of the question of the future relations of the two Churches.

No one who has followed the Church Reform movements in England and Denmark in our day can fail to see some points of contact despite the striking contrast. If it be asked, then, what are the main characteristics of the reform scheme now being discussed in Denmark, it is true, we must reply that they cannot easily be reduced to a short formula; but some questions stand out among numerous minor ones; such are those of parochial church councils; a representative church council; the election of bishops and pastors; and the clerical subscription. The discussion of these and other important matters has not infrequently offered very

Digitized by Google

interesting parallels to the opinions propounded in the English Church. While the Protestant communions on the Continent generally are divided into two parties, an 'orthodox' one and a 'liberal' one, in Denmark three tendencies are discernible, to a certain extent corresponding to the 'high, low and broad' Church views in England. The parties are not so marked as in England, and their interests are often strangely intercrossed; but still the divisions within the Church Committee unmistakeably point to those conflicting principles. Again, while in purely Presbyterian churches the questions of their government and discipline turn on the relations of pastors and congregations, the committee now at work in Denmark have to define also the power of the bishops and the way in which they are to be elected. Here is a point of intersection where the English and Danish Churches meet, but only to diverge again. The crucial question of apostolical succession reveals a difference which, dating from the Reformation, depends upon incompatible principles.

The fundamental difference between the two Churches is perfectly clear and conclusive for the attitude of either. The position of the one is thus stated by Dr. Mason: 'If the English Church in her corporate capacity were to enter into full communion with the Presbyterian Churches, it would not only cause disruption within the English Church itself, it would bar the way to any reunion with the as yet unreformed Churches of Christendom. The cost would be too great.'[1] As regards the other, its rule was laid down when the late Bishop of Sealand, Dr. H. L. Martensen, opposed the design of the newly appointed Bishop of Iceland, who had besought the King to allow him to seek consecration from the English bishops[2]; for it should not be overlooked that the line taken by Dr. Martensen did express the position of the Danish Church, and there cannot be the slightest doubt that any Danish bishop in our own day would act on the same principle.

[1] *Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity*, p. 100.

[2] See *C.Q.R.* April 1891, p. 187. Mason, *Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity*, pp. 133, 134.

Digitized by Google

Now, when the question arises of the relations between the two Churches in future, the answer must be, then, that the doctrine of apostolical succession is a barrier to a full intercommunion. For the present they have to agree to differ. But if a corporate union and co-operation under the existing conditions is impossible, there seems to be every reason to believe that a friendly intercourse between individual members, or even sections, of the two Churches would be possible and practicable. As Dr. Mason has said: 'They [the Danes] are more like English people in the make of their minds than any other people in the world.'[1] And if the views propounded in this article are borne out by a sound interpretation of facts and documents, there are fundamental analogies between the doctrinal standards and ecclesiastical systems of Anglicanism and Lutheranism. It is a suggestive fact that many Danes who have established themselves in England have joined the Anglican Church and feel at home in it. Again, that an interchange of ideas is attainable would seem to be indicated by the actual state of things. The Westcotts and the Lightfoots are well known to Greek scholars in Denmark, and not less the teachers upon whose shoulders their mantles have fallen; the ideas of the *Lux Mundi* school and other currents in English theology have attracted the attention of students of divinity, since, on the whole, an increasing number of Danish students are desirous of learning from all kinds of English thinkers. Correspondingly, the interest taken by English people in Danish affairs has been rapidly growing; and the mention made of the Danish Church by Anglican writers, as quoted above, may be regarded as an omen indicating that it will not be ignored in England in future. At present there are but few on either side who realize the unquestionable analogies between the Church of England and that of Denmark; but we cannot help thinking that an extended intercourse and a fuller interchange of theological thought would serve to pave the way for a closer union and co-operation in a better day to come.

C. E. FLÖYSTRUP.

[1] Mason, *op. cit.* p. 132.

Digitized by Google

ART. V.—PALLADIUS AND EGYPTIAN MONASTICISM.

1. *The Lausiac History of Palladius.* 'Cambridge Texts and Studies,' vi. 1, 2. Edited by Dom E. C. BUTLER. (Cambridge University Press: 1904.)
2. *Palladius und Rufinus.* By E. PREUSCHEN. (Giessen, 1897.)
3. *Das Morgenländische Mönchtum.* By S. SCHIWIETZ. Vol. I. (Mainz, 1904.)
4. *Étude sur le Cénobitisme Pakhomien.* By P. LADEUZE. (Louvain, 1898.)
5. *Das Mönchtum, seine Ideale und seine Geschichte.* By A. HARNACK. 6th edition. (Giessen, 1903.)

A LIVELY interest has been awakened of late in the early history of monasticism. In the main, no doubt, the cause has been the manifest importance and vitality of the institution in more communions than one, but there has been also the curiosity, less honourable in its origin, excited by certain attempts to cast discredit upon the traditional story. A German scholar named Weingarten, animated by the prevalent spirit of doubt, absolutely denied its authenticity some thirty years ago, and was followed by the equally peremptory Dr. Lucius; while a distinguished Coptic scholar of France, M. Amélineau, has combined an equal destructiveness with a pleasure, such as is sometimes regarded as characteristic of his countrymen, in insinuating on the flimsiest of evidence charges against the morality of the Egyptian monks. The latter accusation is easily refuted, while the general attack upon the credibility of the history has provoked a crushing retort. Step by step the ground has been regained; the legendary aspect of many of the early narratives has been shewn to prove rather that the authors shared the superstitions of their age and country than that they were wilful romancers, and that the strange atmosphere in which their characters move is itself a witness to the fact that these are sincere and contemporaneous records of what they believed they saw.

Digitized by Google

But the final and triumphant demonstration has been the work of patient and exact scholars. It was, above all things, necessary that two documents, the *Lausiac History of Palladius* and the anonymous *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*, should be accurately edited and analyzed. This being done, the earlier and later history of the institution would become intelligible, for these records tell of the lives and the methods of monks who themselves laid the foundations of organized asceticism and were almost contemporaries of the first adventurers upon this path. The latter and somewhat less important, though not less interesting, of the two treatises, has been admirably edited by Dr Erwin Preuschen in his *Palladius und Rufinus*; the former, which is the primary authority, has been rescued from confusion and interpolation by the labours of Dom Cuthbert Butler, who has now been raised to the high office of Abbot of Downside, and whose edition of the *Lausiac History* may rank with the best work of his Order in the eighteenth century.

The works thus presented in their true form are thoroughly representative of the whole literature of early monasticism. They are anecdotic and discursive, interested in persons rather than institutions or principles. Nor can the writers be commended as having attempted to give a comprehensive and dispassionate survey of what they saw and heard. Eccentric acts and epigrammatic sayings clung to their memories, and their vision was of high lights and deep shadows. We must read between the lines if we are to understand the average life and spirit of the Egyptian monk in hermitage or convent. But there is a further need for effort and caution on the part of the student. The simple sincerity of such a writer as Palladius is as obvious as the difference between his outlook upon life and that of Herodotus. Yet both were making pilgrimages in search, among other things, of religious information along the banks of the Nile, and the industry of both was rewarded with a harvest of wonderful stories. There had been no change in the standard of probability or of truthfulness among the devotees of two very different faiths, and in our

Digitized by Google

moral judgement we must make due and ample allowance for the incapacity of the race, or perhaps of the class. The undoubted sincerity of the Egyptian monks, displayed in the whole tenour of their life, did not train their mind to appreciate truthfulness for its own sake. They had a dual existence: one life rigidly conversant with practical and theological realities, and another wandering at will in the fields of romance. This must be borne in mind if we are to do justice to these pioneers of monasticism, but it is even more necessary for the student of Herodotus to remember that the Egyptian mind, when trained to contemplation, could simultaneously and comfortably contain both a profound system of thought concerning the unseen world and an unlimited stock of frivolous stories. The intellectual continuity is not broken by the fact that in the pure air of Christianity the stories, while equally astonishing with those of the older time, have grown to be often edifying and always eminently respectable. They do not, it is needless to say, form the staple of the narratives with which we are dealing, nor, indeed, are they in extent a considerable proportion of the whole. But they constantly intrude upon us, and from them we derive no small part of the entertainment which this literature undoubtedly conveys: an entertainment which is akin, however distantly, to that with which Herodotus has delighted so many generations. We need only to be on our guard lest we confuse the hero-worshippers with the heroes, or attach an excessive importance to the unreal when the reality presents itself with vivid and obvious truthfulness. Of no body of earnest Christians in any age can we form a picture more accurate and minute than of the Egyptian monks in their prime. Their merits and the faults which were often the exaggeration of their merits, their deep spirituality and its sometimes naïve expression, their efforts after Christian perfection, not least sincere when they were violent or grotesque, their very human sententiousness and sense of superiority, are all depicted by Palladius and their other admirers with a direct simplicity which is as effective as the most consummate art. Their literary method, by a fortunate

Digitized by Google

coincidence, is exactly suited to their material, and a reader familiar with the decadent classicism of too much patristic literature feels a glad relief when he turns to this happy and natural portraiture.

Egypt was the natural soil from which such a growth should spring. It has been usual, and in the text-books of the Roman Church the assertion is still made, to connect monasticism in the strict sense with that severity of life which from the first was common among serious Christians. We may read in quite recent works how the four daughters of Philip were forerunners of the nuns of later days, and so with the vowed virgins of whom we read from Tertullian onward. But theirs was a life in the world, and their danger came from association with it, and their glory from overcoming its temptations. St. Cyprian only bade them be sober in their bearing and their dress—it is not, indeed, till the time of St. Ambrose that we hear of a characteristic apparel—and contemplates neither solitude nor association as possible for them. But in the days of St. Athanasius there were in Alexandria houses of virgins, though we must regard these as substitutes for the home and places where the home life was lived. In fact, the monastic life for women was first suggested by its proved success in the case of men. It is not, then, in a primitive pursuit of perfection that we are to seek for the origin of the system; still less was it suggested by the need felt by preachers of the Gospel for freedom from the world's encumbrances. It came into existence at an ascertained point of time in the third century, and its novelty no doubt had much to do with the enthusiasm that greeted it.

Nor can we connect it with earlier and non-Christian phenomena which in some ways resembled it. The suggestion has been made, and for a while found a certain acceptance, that there were monks of Sarapis. But Preuschen has demonstrated that his votaries had nothing in common with the monks, and the one point which seemed decisively to favour the hypothesis, the assertion that the great Pachomius before his conversion was himself a priest of Sarapis, has been finally disproved by Ladeuze. The

Digitized by Google

famous 'Therapeutae' of whom we learn from Philo (if, as is probable, he is the author of the *De Vita contemplativa*) are more to the point; but here, again, it is impossible to demonstrate a connexion, and there is a broad interval of time between the days of Claudius and those of Decius. Nor was a spiritual impulse likely to spread from the alien Greek city which stood on Egyptian soil to the indigenous peasantry of Coptic speech, whose one contribution to the movement of the world has been the zeal with which they adopted this new method of Christian devotion. In fact, the pioneers seem to have been free from any infusion of Greek learning. Pachomius did not acquire the language till he was an abbot; St. Anthony, a peasant proprietor, probably never spoke it; many monks of the same class could not even read their native tongue—as, for instance, that Paphnutius surnamed Cephalas, who could interpret all Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament by what Palladius regarded as a prophetic gift, though the written page had no meaning for him.

A more probable origin has often been assigned in the Decian persecution. It is certain that in the year 250 many endangered Christians fled into the desert; but it is more than likely that their purpose was to return to their homes so soon as the storm had blown over. Still there is reason to believe that at least one refugee grew enamoured of a solitary life. Paul of Thebes at the age of sixteen is said to have escaped denunciation by a flight which led him through the rocky ranges which border the Nile Valley and far across the desert to a point which few of his successors were to reach, almost on the verge of the Red Sea. There he was truly a solitary, in his little cave by his spring and his date-palm: a hermit, or denizen of the desert, in the strictest sense, and the first to whom we can with certainty apply the famous name of 'Monk.' For a word which had hitherto been simply an adjective, appearing first in literature in the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, was now seized for Christian use. The new life needed a new name. For ninety years, it is said, Paul lived alone in austerity and meditation, and the knowledge of his

Digitized by Google

lonely struggle must have raised in many minds the thought that they, too, in some humbler way, might well enter upon the same conflict. Twenty years after Paul had vanished into the desert a more famous man, the Antony whom Athanasius has immortalized, took his first step in the same direction. At first he lingered, as we shall see that many less aspiring souls were to do, on the edges of civilization, but at the age of thirty-five, about the year 285, he, too, made his plunge, and made it with a definite ideal formed in his mind. Loneliness and austerity were to be but means to an end, and that end perfection. Paul had been in advance of his age ; Antony caught the imagination of the day. Gradually disciples followed him to his retreat in the same region where Paul was already settled. In a loose way they attached themselves to their master, who made no attempt to organize their life or guide their thoughts. But so distant a region could not become the focus of a great movement. In regions not less inhospitable but nearer to the life of Egypt, the Nitrian and Scetic deserts, enthusiasts among whom the Antonian ideal had spread assembled in multitudes, and as their numbers increased so grew also their zeal. And from this undisciplined zeal there was to emerge by a natural development that ordered monasticism to which religion and learning in later ages were to be so deeply indebted.

But we must not think that the mass of its votaries adopted this life without tentative steps. Had there been no Antony these would still have been taken, though they might have been barren of result. We must look for its beginning as a prevalent custom to the habit of the most serious among the Christian peasantry of Egypt of retiring to the outskirts of their village and there living a life of quiet manual labour and of meditation. We must think of them as each sheltering from the sun under a little hut of boughs reared by his own hands, cultivating perhaps a plot of garden ground for his own sustenance and for sale, or weaving rush-mats to be taken in due time to market. This latter employment, being sedentary and allowing the mind full play as the fingers plied their

Digitized by Google

mechanical task, seems to have been regarded as especially suitable for their avocation. The life was not one of isolation from the world, withdrawn though it was from its competition and from the dangers of society. The recluse worked for his living, and sold for his modest sustenance the produce of his toil: in this preliminary phase we do not find him supported by his admirers in the world. Nor was he, in his dwelling close to his old home and friends, isolated from their society. Many of his hours, no doubt, were spent in meditation, or in prayer, or the repetition of Psalms; but he was always accessible, and there was a constant desire on the part of admiring neighbours to benefit by his discourse. And this discourse, as we may judge from the fragments which have survived, was, as a rule, well worthy of attention. In our own recent fiction we have become familiar with the pithy and sententious utterance on moral and religious topics of the graver minds among humble Scottish Presbyterians. Their solitary hours at the loom or the plough, with minds exercised upon the same problems of the relation between doctrine and life, and the same possibilities of devotional attainment, have bred in them the same capacity for concise and impressive speech. In the ancient and in the modern instances there may be in this something angular, some half-unconscious sense of superiority; but as the ancient Spartans and some of the Greek philosophers gained the same power through the discipline of strenuous action and of sustained thought, so in these Christian instances we must recognize the fruit of a true discipline of character. As time went on, no doubt, this mode of speech became the mark of a class, and an imitative devotee could learn the fashion as easily as a modern literary man; but a certain dignity always, and often a power and even a charm, attaches to the brief sayings of the Egyptian monks. Far more than their austerities or eccentricities it is their words that make the interest of their lives.

But this life on the edge of the village which, Athanasius tells us, was usual at the first, soon ceased to satisfy. For a while the hermits hovered around their homes like

Digitized by Google

Chronius, who ventured fifteen thousand paces into the wilderness and there built his cell, and sometimes they would, after a while, creep nearer, like Nathanael, who found that harder temptations, and therefore worthier to be faced, befell him in his original cell than in that which he had afterwards raised in a remoter spot. So he returned, and it is significant of the rising standard of austerity that when Palladius visited the scene, a little before 400 A.D., no monk would condescend to inhabit a spot so near to the dwellings of men. Nathanael's cell had remained empty for the fifteen years since his death. But others, and without censure, resumed their life among men, as, for instance, that Isidore, who was Palladius' first informant. In later life he held the position of priest and hospitaller in the Church of Alexandria, and used his opportunities of intercourse to tell his stories of the heroes of asceticism, and to counsel his hearers to embrace the monastic life.

The primary aim was perfection, to be attained by escape from the distractions of the world. The soul could then devote itself to its own improvement, conquering its enemy, the body. 'It kills me: I kill it,' said one enthusiast in explanation of his long-continued austerities, which seemed to his admirers to have fulfilled their purpose, though he would not forsake them. The mind, in its retirement from active pursuits, could also surrender itself to contemplation; and we must recognize the success with which the path of mysticism was followed in a climate and with a range of ideas which seem unsuitable for the stimulation of severe or exalted thought. They wished to be perfect; they were threatened with the danger of forfeiting their own perfection while they ministered to the edification, or perhaps merely to the curiosity, of those who resorted to their tabernacles. And so the further steps were taken, and the adventurers plunged deeper and deéper into the wilderness. Yet it was difficult to shake off the serious admirers of the Christian athlete; for many, without the resolution or the originality to take the first step for themselves, were ready to follow a recognized leader even in his further advances. He had no thought

Digitized by Google

but for himself and for the attainment of an ideal, but he could not shake off disciples whom a contagious enthusiasm gathered round him. So Chronius 'enthroned' himself, to use Palladius' term, in a hermitage by a well which he dug some miles from the river, and there abode for the remainder of a long life. He had vowed never to return to the society of men, but though he kept his vow he could not escape from his fellows. Some intercourse, in any case, he must have had with them, for he maintained himself by his own labour, and so must have employed messengers to convey his handiwork to market and bring him back the price; nor did he shun visitors who came to admire or to learn. He was, in fact, an ascetic of the original type, but so eminent that there gathered around him a company of no less than two hundred hermits desirous of his teaching. Among them were men of mark for spiritual insight, such as Jacob the lame, a 'perfect gnostic,' though perhaps Clement would not have recognized an altogether kindred spirit in him, and Paphnutius, surnamed Cephalas, who, as we have said, could not read, but had a grace of knowledge which enabled him to interpret all passages of either Testament. Here, again, we see that devout concentration upon Scripture which connects these ancient ascetics with Christians very different in their thoughts and environment in later ages. This company surrounding Chronius had no bond save that which connected all with the common teacher. It was only, on a larger and a lasting scale, such resort to a meditative recluse as had been usual since men began to devote their life to thought and prayer. Chronius had no responsibility for the worship or the meditations of his admirers, save in so far as he replied to their inquiries; still less was he responsible for their sustenance or for their discipline. It was a parish, for practical purposes, which arose about him, and as such was recognized by the bishop, who conferred priest's orders upon him that he might minister to the spiritual needs of the society. And, as a normal Christian community, though composed entirely of males and of ascetics, it differed in its regular provision of the Eucharist from the

Digitized by Google

usual assemblages of monks. In them the sacramental life, which was obviously difficult for the single hermit, and impossible when with heightened austerity he rejected all intercourse with his kind, could not be highly regarded. They inherited the traditions of their solitary precursors, and it was not on Egyptian soil that the usual means of grace were made a normal part of the monastic life. No doubt when the opportunity came, as it often must since priests frequently joined themselves to the societies of monks, it was gladly received; but the great St. Basil of Caesarea was the first to ordain, by an improvement upon the Pachomian rule, that communion should be a regular part of the life of his monks.

Without a formal organization no higher point than this could be reached. The hosts of ascetics who lived without rule in hovels or caves scattered over the Nitrian or Scetic wastes represented a more rudimentary type of the institution. They had the encouragement, it is true, of numbers, though they had severed themselves from the society and the admiration of their homes, but the novelty of the life and its excitement tempted them to rivalry. Even when the competition was for the attainment of the completest solitude, the recluse was always conscious that eyes were upon him, and that another might win to-morrow the prize of reputation which he had just gained by the most difficult feat as yet accomplished of isolation or of abstinence. But the history of the Church furnished another and perhaps a more powerful motive. Sufferers for their Master had always been held in peculiar honour, and from the beginning of the third century, if not earlier, this honour had expressed itself in the form of a definite precedence. Like bishops and presbyters, they sat in the assembly of the faithful, while deacons and laity stood; their 'confession' was regarded as in some sense an ordination, and they claimed the right, within very vague limits, of restoring to the communion of the Church those who had lapsed in the conflict in which they themselves had stood firm. They came to receive, almost in a technical sense, the title 'Friends of God'; and thus Eusebius in

Digitized by Google

his florid panegyric at the opening of the Church at Tyre addresses them, while Tertullian had exhorted the penitent to grovel before the presbyters and to clasp the knees of the 'cari Dei.' By the time of Eusebius it had come to be an honorary distinction; in the days of Tertullian the prerogative of the 'confessor' was an important reality. And such, no doubt, it would have continued to be, had not the multitude who claimed, with more or less justice, the title and its privileges become unwieldly and dangerous. It is the merit of the Church of Carthage under St. Cyprian and of his Roman contemporaries that they withstood the demand of the 'confessors' to control the discipline of the Church. The clergy were successful, but they had found it necessary to exercise tact as well as determination, and part of the price which they had to pay for the surrender of the confessors' prerogatives was a full recognition of their titular position. The culmination of their glory came with the persecution of Diocletian and his successors. With the proclamation of peace there flocked into every church from prison and mine and wilderness a crowd of sufferers, justly proud of their achievement. And when it became clear that in the new age of favour for Christianity they could have no successors, the survivors, as their ranks were thinned by death, rose steadily higher in the veneration of the faithful. But theirs was not merely a personal distinction; they had come to be a recognized grade in the Church. There must be some method found of perpetuating the succession. If a hostile state would not inflict suffering, the enthusiast would inflict it upon himself, and if the suffering were real and the devotion which prompted it sincere, the result would be equivalent to that of a new pagan persecution. There would be a fresh host of 'confessors' entitled to the honours of their forerunners. Such reasoning satisfied the Christian mind, and by the middle of the fourth century 'confessor' had come to be the recognized title for the monk or ascetic.

There was, of course, one broad distinction. The new confession was not a sharp, temporary trial, to be rewarded by a lifelong respect from the whole brotherhood. We

Digitized by Google

hear, it is true, of cases in which the ascetic did return to the world, and was duly respected for the trial to which he had submitted himself; but such cases were exceptional. The normal confession of the new type was lifelong, and its merit increased with its duration. Isolation and austerity practised by one who could at any moment return to the world offered a temptation increasingly severe as each day passed, and therefore a steady increase of honour when that temptation was steadily resisted. And the honour itself had to be manifested and appreciated in a new way. There were none of the familiar tokens of distinction; there was only the silent consciousness of veneration given and received. But this was enough to encourage the enthusiast; at least, when it was joined, as we have no right to doubt that it usually was, with the sincere desire for a growth towards Christian perfection. Persecution had been most severe and the honours of the confessor most conspicuous at Alexandria, and we may assign to the ascetics who withdrew from that city into the neighbouring wastes the desire to perpetuate the class of confessors as their primary motive. The Coptic villagers, a race as alien from the Greeks of Alexandria as the native Irish from the Ulster immigrants, deserve the equal honour of conceiving the thought of a Christian perfection to be approached by an uninterrupted attention to the things of the soul. To neither does it seem that there occurred as the primary motive the employment of the whole life for the direct glory of God, an aim which their successors were in time to propose to themselves.

But the process by which the goal of perfection or the renown of confessorship was to be reached became itself to its whole-hearted pursuers an attraction. Sometimes reasonably, sometimes in defiance of reason, they chose paths which they followed in either case into extravagance. It is true that in the earlier stages of the movement we find no artificial sufferings; there were no chains or spikes to serve as a substitute for the tortures by which the confessors in pagan days had won their renown. But discomfort they must have, and they found it in rejecting the ordinary

Digitized by Google

amenities and sometimes even the decencies of life. The usual clothing of the Egyptian was a linen tunic, and we find monks who practised and insisted on others practising a scrupulous neatness in the use of this cool and appropriate apparel. But others preferred the Scriptural example of the Baptist in wearing a robe woven of camel's hair, or even the oppressive weight of a leathern tunic. Paul the hermit wove his own of the strips of palm-leaves; it must have resembled in texture the mats which the recluses habitually worked with their hands. But a sack served Hilarion of Palestine as his tunic, and Palladius found a Sarapion—Dom Butler counts eight of the name in the ranks of the ascetics—who wore a linen sheet wrapped round him like a shroud. Whatever the material, the more rigorous ascetics wore it to tatters; Pachomius himself, who introduced order into asceticism, resented the kindly officiousness of disciples who replaced his old tunic by a new one. Others would mend their garment till it became a patchwork, while Pambo pronounced that no true monk should wear a robe save such as might lie for three days in the highway without any traveller deigning to pick it up. Whatever the comfort, or discomfort, of the tunic, and of the long mantle often worn out of doors, the cape of sheepskin or of goatskin borne upon the shoulders must have been a heavy load under the Egyptian sun. Such was the clothing of those who were more or less in contact with their kind. If they were often neglectful, we may imagine how fragmentary was the garb of those who shunned the dwellings of men, nor is it surprising to learn that in the deeper recesses of the deserts the traveller might find anchorites who had abandoned all clothing, and we may believe, if we can, that their unshorn hair had grown till it was a sufficient covering.

There was, however, little discomfort in the wearing of scanty clothes in a climate of continuous warmth; and there may have lurked unperceived in the mind even of the austerest monk some of that sense of comfort which prompts the modern to retain an old coat long after its seemliness has departed. In regard to food, even when all allowance is

Digitized by Google

made for the lightness of diet which is suited to an almost tropical temperature, the case was widely different. The life of the monk was usually sedentary, and must have been painfully monotonous for those whose brains were incapable of strenuous and continuous thought. The irksomeness he would regard as part of the discipline to which he was willingly subjecting himself; but he could not avoid counting the hours which separated the few fixed points of his day. Among these the meal, or meals, must have been exceedingly prominent. It is a common experience that travellers on a long voyage come to look forward with an eager expectation to the hours of their meals. It is not that they are especially hungry, still less that they are greedy; it is because a meal is a definite break in a somewhat purposeless expanse of time. It was so with the early monks. They had a liberty uncontrolled by the orderly arrangements of a mail steamer, and often they were tempted to use it to anticipate by an hour their midday meal. This slight and very natural offence is gravely noticed and rebuked. No reproach could be made against the material or the cookery of their simple fare. Simple it had need to be, and even deficient as compared with the sustenance needful for a busy man; for the special trial of the isolated monk was a temptation for which the very circumstances of his life gave him the leisure, that of brooding over thoughts of sensuality. If he were full-fed, the temptation would be overpowering; fasting was needed to correct the balance. Thus the pallor of inadequate nutrition came to be accepted as one of the marks of the true monk, while the listlessness and melancholy which it engendered became in their turn enemies to be withstood. Acedia or accidie, or however else the word may be spelled, has a very prominent place in monastic literature, and doubtless, though it was an enemy of their own creation, they deserve due honour for confronting and overcoming it.

But the limitation of food came itself to be regarded as an opportunity for excellence. The Pachomian rule, which allowed two meals a day, may be regarded as representing the average standard of abstinence; nor was it a low one in

Digitized by Google

the case of men who made it a principle that they should take no pleasure in their food. Their choice, indeed, was such that ordinary mortals could not easily have found satisfaction in it. Animal food was absent, and in practice, though not in principle, wine also was eschewed. The bread was often kept deliberately till it was dry, and in a parching climate it was regarded as a merit to drink as little water as was possible. The fruits of the country, and especially dates, were commonly used; rustic monks, like the country children of England, knew of a multitude of edible seeds and fruits from which some nutriment could be derived. The plot which was watered by their well would furnish a salad of raw herbs. But some shrank from such luxury. They would eat nothing that had been cultivated, or they would refrain from anything that had undergone the process of cooking. In such a case beans or grain which had been soaked in cold water was the daily food. And often the athlete raised his standard by abstinence from his second meal, and, as that grew easy, by eating only on alternate days. But this was a moderate renunciation in comparison with some of which we read, as when for seventy successive weeks an ascetic partook of only one meal in the week. This may well be an exaggeration, but it is obvious that the ambition to excel in abstinence must often have led to a death in life during which existence could only be maintained at the price of an entire cessation from all activity of body and of mind. In such cases the reward was not the spiritual advancement of the devotee but the knowledge that he was the object of public wonder. When Dorotheus of Thebes was asked by Palladius why in his old age—he had been a hermit for sixty years—he mortified his body by one scanty meal a day, he could answer, no doubt with justification, 'It kills me: I kill it.' There was the consciousness of a definite purpose which had been attained. But when an admired faster, to whom his neighbours looked up with awe for his triumphs of abstinence, was invited by the shrewd Zeno to spend a few days in his cell, he was humiliated to find that his powers had failed. Zeno informed him, when he expressed surprise

Digitized by Google

at the failure, that flattery had been his food, and advised him in future to take a meal every day and be careful that his good deeds were done in secret. But rarely can such good sense have reached the ears of an ascetic; and perhaps few were aware of the practical advice of St. Jerome, who bids the monk eat as slowly as possible. In this way, he says, the nourishment is greater, just as the earth is more refreshed by a gentle than by a violent rain.

The life, in any case, conduced to longevity. Exaggeration was inevitable, it is true, in an age when length of years was the traditional attribute of the sage, and when the date of a birth which had never been accurately recorded was lost in the mists of time and there were no kinsfolk and no landmarks in an eventless life to call it to mind. But the uniform testimony of the visitors to the wilderness assures us that veterans were numerous who believed that they had passed their hundredth year. It is said that the Coptic monks of the present day, whose habits, physical and mental, have probably varied but little from those of their earliest predecessors, attain to a similar length of days. For we must not think of the normal monk as attempting austerities or attaining heights or depths of feeling, such as have given fame to the more remarkable members of his class. The modern Benedictine from his higher level of civilization and of emotion is apt to look down upon the schismatic peasants who pursue in what he regards as thoughtless indolence their traditional mortifications. We may better regard them as genuine inheritors and maintainers of the pristine average of monastic life, though assuredly it would not have survived had it not been illustrated by more aspiring characters than those of the crowd.

The dwelling of the monks, so long as it furnished shelter from the sun, might in a rainless climate be as small and as simple as they would. We have seen that the earliest recluses raised their huts on the verge of their village, and doubtless of the clay or the wickerwork which was customary in rustic places. No change would take place in their habitation when they made their first modest

Digitized by Google

step of a mile or two towards the desert : the toil of carrying their pitcher of water through the sand from the river was a sensible hardship, but often some little spring was the attraction which decided their choice, and then a more perfect retirement was purchased at an easy cost. Even the alkaline water of the waste became through use palatable and wholesome, as on many a South African farm where the visitor finds the water playing strange pranks with his digestion, though he does not, like the ancients, attribute his hosts' immunity to miraculous causes. But soon their eye was caught by the rocky ranges which bounded the valley, and a ready home was found in the quarried sepulchres of ancient Egypt or in natural caverns. There the solitary could find a solitude worthy of the name, unless indeed he made a reputation and imitators gathered around him. From the concourse of village admirers he was safe in such a 'monastery,' for so his cell was styled. And when the solitude was attained it was found by the best to be a real aid towards their communion with God. As Moses climbed into the cloud on Sinai, so they went alone into the wilderness for the same sacred converse. Solitude was Paradise ; it was loneliness to be in the crowd. No effort was too great in search of perfect isolation. We hear of a hermitage which lay at the distance of a day's journey and a half into the desert from the nearest abode of men, and the journey had to be made by night, for there was no track and bearings must be taken by the stars. It was St. Antony who first took the plunge, and his followers were no commonplace votaries ; they were either resolute through spiritual desire or through the monomania for solitude which overcame some excited brains. For we find some whom isolation itself, and not its religious use, attracted. We hear of one carving out for himself cell and passage and cell, each further into the mountain side, till his dwelling became as complex and as rude as a badger's earth. We find another equally successful in shunning his kind by fixing his abode amid the slime and fever and stinging flies of the marshes of the Delta. When other, and more rational, monks expostulated with one such ascetic for his choice,

Digitized by Google

he grimly replied that a life spent in such a residence was preferable to an hour of hell. In such surroundings none of the activities of life were possible. We hear of a hermit who had not spoken for thirty years, and we may reasonably doubt the value of his meditations when the organ of intelligence was paralyzed through disuse. Nor can we doubt that the delusions to which the monks were often subject were mainly due to the want of balance produced by such a life.

These delusions play a large, and to our mind a painful, part in the early days of monasticism. But in the eyes of contemporary admirers its morbid developments were among the best credentials of the new asceticism. It was an age of wonders, and the wonders were by no means confined to the Christians. A religious and cultured pagan lived in a world of marvels at least as astonishing and quite as probable. The atmosphere in which such beliefs were bred was that of the century, not that of a particular creed. And the simple monks of the Nile valley were not far removed in their modes of thought from those Africans of whom Dr. E. B. Tylor tells in his *Primitive Culture* that their sense of reality is so faint and their dreams so vivid that they are never either thoroughly awake or thoroughly asleep. To this we must add the pleasure in gossip, already mentioned as characteristic of religionists of more creeds than one on the banks of the Nile : a pleasure in passing on stories of wonder which grew steadily more wonderful in the process of transmission, and indulgence in which so demoralized the monastic life that one of Pachomius' rules of self-denial, and we may be sure that it was an abstinence keenly felt, was that no tales of things seen or heard outside the monastery should be repeated within its walls. The same necessity compelled St. Benedict in his recension of the Pachomian rule, to repeat the order. He had found that such narratives were, as he calls it in his quaint Latin, 'plurima distructio' to his monks. In the travels of Palladius no less than seventy wonders, as Dom Butler counts, were reported to that conscientious inquirer; for only ten does he vouch from personal knowledge, but his

Digitized by Google

confidence in his informants is not less strong than his trust to his own eyes and ears. Indeed, we have the evidence of Palladius' eyes for a marvel at least as great as any performed at the Egyptian Hall. A boy possessed by an evil spirit was brought to Macarius of Alexandria while Palladius was visiting that eminent ascetic. Macarius laid his hands upon him and prayed with such effect that the boy was lifted into the air, swelled like a wineskin to a monstrous size, burst and discharged a torrent of water, and then subsided to his natural dimensions and was a reasonable and healthy being. Macarius anointed him with holy oil, poured water upon him and delivered him to his father with the injunction to abstain for forty days from flesh and from wine. The same Macarius was the hero according to Palladius—who reports the story, however, only as a current tale—of an adventure in the vein of Apuleius. The evil lover of a virtuous woman bribed a magician to transform her into a mare. Her distressful husband—for she was not so lonely as the Apuleian ass—led her to the saint, who did not need to be told of the trouble, for he had received a revelation. He blessed water and sprinkled it over her. She recovered her form and was dismissed with her husband, after a warning to be careful in the discharge of her religious duties, since it was her absence for five weeks from the Eucharist that had rendered her subject to the power of magic. In our estimate of the credibility of these records, of which that of Palladius is one of the most sober, we must bear in mind that these strange incidents which he had seen or heard of were no less credible to him than the conventional visions and miracles of ordinary hagiography in which his story, it is needless to say, abounds.

But we must in justice take into our account the powers which certainly accrue to mind and will when they are purified and strengthened. Insight into character, that strange yet real power called 'second sight,' healthful influence upon the mental and physical state of others, the gift of attracting and controlling the wildest creatures of the desert, are endowments which we should expect and which we find among the best of the solitaries. We find also that they

Digitized by Google

were not over-valued. The utterances of St. Antony in this respect, as reported by St. Athanasius, are the same in tone as those of Gregory the Great in his famous warning to St. Augustine not to think too highly of the miracles which had, as they both believed, accompanied the conversion of Kent. And the wiser among the Egyptians were careful to impress the lesson that a fall from grace was possible for those who had attained to the power of miracle or vision; nay, more, they could allege striking instances in which the exercise of such power was itself the occasion of falling.

There remains one more aspect of this supernatural side of monasticism to be mentioned. The cases are numerous and clear in which a mental temptation personified itself as a bodily assailant. Like Henry Morton in *Old Mortality*, Palladius was the unseen hearer of defiance against the spiritual enemy; but it must be confessed that the Egyptian Mark had a more prosaic opponent and used a less dignified vocabulary than Balfour of Burleigh. His language, in fact, has a strong resemblance to that of Falstaff. But demons were sometimes visible. Macarius of Alexandria saw countless tiny Ethiopians overrunning the persons of an assembly of monks. If they touched his eyes, the victim slept; if they pushed a finger into his mouth, he yawned; they conjured up before his imagination any image that might distract him from his prayers. And one solitary, harassed as he sat in his cell by an invisible crowd of demons who demanded entrance, had the satisfaction of beholding their final disappearance in the guise of a troop of wild asses. But the monks had the consolation that angels were as real to them as demons. Stories to this effect are numerous. To one of them the Eucharist was habitually ministered by an angel; while another had an angel as his domestic attendant. And this vivid and concrete presentation of powers elsewhere invisible was probably the cause of that error which brought a later generation of monks into sharp conflict with the Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria. They gave a literal meaning to the figurative language of Scripture, and inferred from the

Digitized by Google

mention of His eyes and ears that the Deity is corporeal. Hence arose what Socrates calls a relentless war—Theophilus, with a minority of the monks on his side, branding his adversaries as Anthropomorphians, while they retorted that he and his followers were impious Origenists. But force was on the side of Theophilus and his opponents were silenced. From such an aberration no profit could come; but the developed doctrine of guardian angels was the direct result of the vivid imagination of Egyptian ascetics. And the same imagination has the honour of introducing into Christian literature the notion of journeys into the realms of the dead. Their rudimentary visions are the germ of the whole splendid range of Keltic imaginings, from the Purgatory of St. Patrick and the Penitence of Tundal down to the Sleeping Bard, as well as of the supreme example in the *Divina Commedia*.

Hitherto we have been considering the separate life of individuals. But, lonely as they might be, they had always the consciousness of neighbourhood. Even the most distant from mankind cherished the thought that others were less remote than they. Comparison and even rivalry was constantly in their mind. It had its good side in keeping many up to the mark; it had its bad side in such extravagances as we have noticed, and sometimes in strange outbursts of spiritual pride and affectation, as when Dorotheus would habitually weep at his meals over the painful necessity under which he, a spiritual being and entitled to feast upon the delights of Paradise, lay of eating earthly food. But even competition was a bond of union, for monks were not striving to excel the world. Over it the victory was already won; the objects of their rivalry were their brother monks. Hence it was natural that they should cluster together, sometimes in their thousands, in what for them was neighbourhood. They would welcome a new recruit, assembling to build his hut as Connaught peasants to-day will raise in a few hours the cabin of a newly-wedded pair. He might be his own master or he might put himself, voluntarily and for such a space as he chose, under the orders of an experienced ascetic: he might live

Digitized by Google

alone or in company with some few of his brethren. In no case could he isolate himself from his monastic world. He must meet others in common worship, at least occasionally, unless he forsook mankind altogether; even then some religious tourist would sooner or later discover him. In ordinary cases he would be well informed of the feats and the sayings of his brethren, and if he were spurred to say or do something still more striking there was nothing to restrain and much to tempt him to extravagance. Such a monasticism as St. Antony had encouraged was fertile in men of varied excellence, and it set the example, which was to have evil as well as good effects, of regarding monasticism as Christianity in the full sense. But it could neither ensure discipline among its adherents nor develop a consistent type of character. This was to be the work of Pachomius the Great, as his followers called him, who completed the work which Antony had begun.

The two men were almost exact contemporaries. Both began to gather disciples about the year 305, though in this respect Pachomius had the less success. His rule, the first of its kind, was written before 328, and he died in 346. He was personally an ascetic of a strict type: the 'Stone Couch of St. Pachomius' in the *Monastery* is one of Scott's many pieces of recondite knowledge of antiquity. But his genius appeared in his recognition of the truth that uniformity of life and a level standard of excellence could not be attained without a check upon the ambitions of the more eager ascetics. The rule was to govern the life of all; even the abbot was to govern in accordance with its precepts. There were to be no eccentricities of life; food and clothing were to be simple and seemly. There was to be order and silence in the performance of duties; monks were to work for their living, at some trade in the monastery or as hired labourers in the harvest field. Soon lands of their own were obtained, and the monastery grew into an industrial organization, with some of the dangers to which such a society is liable. But from the first charity was rejected: monasticism was to be self-supporting. For the spiritual life there were the reading and exposition of

Digitized by Google

Scripture and regular hours of prayer. The Eucharist, as we have seen, had not a prominent place; its reception and attendance at its celebration were not more frequent than in the case of devout laymen. Monks were not to be ordained to the priesthood, though priests might become monks. An ordered life was secured by the residence of the whole body within a ring-wall, such as may still be seen in the ruins of the early Irish monasteries. The monks were grouped in houses, either by trade or by race; there was not only the supervision of monastic superiors but also the mutual control of the brethren, though as yet without that minute and often humiliating surveillance which grew up in the Benedictine system. This disciplined life, moderated by the fixing of a standard at which all might aim, was as possible for women as for men, and thus for the first time the monastic career was thrown open to them. The spirit of the whole life was that of discipline, though as yet without that insistence upon military analogies which afterwards prevailed. It is true that the suggestion has been made that Pachomius learnt directly from his military experience, and modelled his communities upon it. But he had no more than one brief term of service, while yet a pagan, as a pressed militia-man. He saw no fighting and withdrew to civil life as quickly as he could. He must have acquired elsewhere the gift of organization which enabled him to control several thousands of monks dwelling in numerous monasteries and in no case bound by vows.

The pattern set by this great man, one of the epoch-makers of Christendom though so little regarded in our day, was instantly followed. For a while the Antonian method was more popular, and the fungus-growth of eccentrics with strange titles and stranger habits of whom we read in Jerome and Epiphanius was more conspicuous. But St. Basil and St. Benedict, loyal disciples of Pachomius, have stamped his mark upon all the later developments of monasticism; and even its intellectual life had its starting-point at the Tabennisi which Pachomius founded. The practical psychology which was studied there with its classification

Digitized by Google

of mental states and especially of vices was to be the germ of all casuistry and of much scholastic philosophy. It was a great work, and one begun in transparent and disinterested simplicity of heart; and amid all the vicissitudes and irregularities of its history we recognize with gratitude and reverence the value of its ideal, that of a common life persistently and unselfishly striving towards the highest end.

E. W. WATSON.

ART. VI.—LONDON HOME INDUSTRIES AND THE SWEATING OF WOMEN'S LABOUR.

1. *Problems of Modern Industry* (1898). *Women's Industrial Council. Home Industries of Women in London.* By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB. (London: Longmans).
2. *Women's Work and Wages.* By E. CADBURY and G. SHANN. (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)
3. *Pictures and Problems* and *The Problem of the Home Workers.* By T. HOLMES. (London: E. Arnold, 1900.)
4. *Sweated Industries.* By R. MUDIE SMITH. (London: *Daily News* Office, 1906.)
5. *Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Sweating.* First Report, 1888; Second Report, 1888; Third Report, 1889; Fourth and Fifth Reports, 1890. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.)

I.

JUST two years ago, by the kind permission of the Duke and Duchess of Sutherland, a number of women were taken by the writer to Stafford House that they might give a public exposition of the lives, the work, and the earnings of London Home Workers. Each woman and the life which she led were well known to him, and each was a *bona fide* representative of some sweated trade. A few words will make clear both the method of the selection and the reasons for it. In the first place, each woman

Digitized by Google

chosen maintained herself by her own exertions, and worked at some particular trade in her own home, fetching from the factory the materials, and returning to the factory the finished articles. Secondly, care was taken that they should include only those who were extremely skilful, and who had been engaged in their special work for many years, this selection being necessary if a correct estimate were to be obtained of the earnings of such women and the hours which they worked. Thirdly, in selecting the trades to be represented, only those trades were included which exist on a large scale. Briefly, these are the making of ladies' costumes, children's coats, cloaks, &c., babies' bonnets, fur-sewing, artificial flowers, match-boxes, fountain-pen boxes, sweet and chocolate boxes, toothbrushes, and ladies' skirts.

These trades, then, it may fairly be said, were represented by experts. It was impossible not to admire their skill, and at the same time scarcely possible, as one looked at them, to refrain from shuddering, for their dreadfully automatic movements were the outcome of endless repetition. But, such as they were, the workers selected represented not only the industries in which thousands of women in London are engaged, but they represented also the lives which thousands of women have to lead and the suffering they endure.

We propose to take eleven typical cases, and without exaggeration, or laying on of 'colour,' to endeavour to set before our readers a fair picture of these women, of their different homes, and of the conditions under which they live, and work, and die.

They looked very tidy and respectable as they sat at their work in Stafford House; for self-respect was not yet dead within them, and they had made the best of themselves. But no one who watched them could fail to notice how quiet and how passive they were. There was no animation in their features, no gleam of interest, but just a touch of pathetic wonder, as if they would ask what it was all about. Their presence and their appearance were an object-lesson, but they had not come to give utterance to

Digitized by Google

their wrongs; for to them wrongs are non-existent—they have become human machines.

One by one they were called to the platform to answer questions, holding their work in their hands. No. 1 was an artificial flower maker, and held a great basket of well-arranged flowers, which excited considerable admiration.

'Are these all of your own making?' the writer asked.

'Yes, sir.'

'Did you draw and cut all the wire for these flowers?'

'Yes, sir.'

'Did you fix and shape all those petals on the wire stems?'

'Yes, sir.'

'Now tell me, please, how much do you get for making these lovely roses?'

'Two shillings per gross.'

'The violets?'

'Sixpence per gross.'

'These clusters of apple-blossom, how much?'

'One shilling and sixpence a gross.'

And so on with regard to all the contents of the basket.

'How long have you been a flower-maker?'

'Ever since I was seven years old—I am now sixty.'

'How much money can you earn in one hour?'

'One penny farthing, sir.'

'How many hours do you work daily?'

'Sixteen, when I have the work to do.'

'How much rent do you pay for your room?'

'Four-and-sixpence a week, sir.'

A half-blind man about her own age was listening to her, and as she stepped down from the platform he gave her his hand, and she sat down beside him. Husband and wife, for many years and interminable hours they had sat at flower-making together, he stamping out the petals and colouring them, and she moulding and mounting them. Now he is half-blind, and dropsy and heart-disease have laid hold on him; so she must work for both, and bravely she does it.

Digitized by Google

No. 2 was a costume machinist, and shewed two costumes for ladies such as she was accustomed to make. For these she gets tenpence each, and finds her own machine and thread. For eighteen years her daughter and herself have sat at their machines making costumes. They work fourteen hours daily, and the two, combining their efforts, can earn seven shillings and sixpence in two days—that is, with the aid of *her own* machine, each woman can earn one shilling and tenpence in fourteen hours. But they must buy their own thread, and this costs them one shilling and fourpence weekly. Seldom do their combined earnings for the week amount to one guinea.

No. 2 is forty-five years of age; her hair is white, her face is wrinkled and furrowed, her hands are tremulous, and her nerves are broken. Mother and daughter live in a poor street. Next door to them is a small public-house, and at half-past twelve its doors are closed. 'Mother, the men have just gone by; the public-house is closed. Let us go to bed.' So the machines rest, and a few hours' silence follow, before the daily round begins again.

No. 3 was a maker of boxes to hold fountain-pens, for which she gets one shilling per gross. She is but a poor specimen of humanity. She is small in stature, sharp in features, and bent in body; she is hunch-backed, her arms are long and skinny, her fingers long and bony. But those skinny arms and bony fingers can work with the speed of a shuttle and the dead certainty of an automatic machine. Better still, that broken body holds a very brave heart. She works for herself and her old mother; she can earn about one penny per hour. Her mother is partly paralyzed, and lies in bed most of her time. Sometimes, however, she is propped up in her bed, and her old fingers ply the scissors as she does her best to help the hunchback daughter.

No. 4 was a young widow with three children, and she produced toothbrushes, which were passed round for inspection. There are sixty-two little holes in the body of each brush, and sixty-two little bunches of bristles have

Digitized by Google

to be picked up in exact quantities, given a correct bend, passed through the little holes, and left tight and firm, of proper length, and fastened at the back with copper wire.

'What do you get for these?'

'Fourpence a dozen brushes, sir.'

'You are a quick and clever brush-maker?'

'I'm as good as most, sir!'

'How long does it take you to do a dozen brushes?'

'I can make one dozen in two hours, but I can't keep on at that rate.'

'What rent do you pay?'

'Five-and-sixpence for two rooms, sir.'

No. 5 was another widow. She and her daughter, who stood with her on the platform, were a refined and fairly educated pair—a moving picture of struggling respectability. The work which they exhibited was very dainty. The first costume was a child's pelisse made of cream merino, trimmed and flounced all over and decorated with lace, &c.

'We get sevenpence for that, sir, and we find our own silk and thread.'

'What do you get for the sky-blue pelisse?'

'The same price, sir; but it takes us longer than the other.'

'What time do you begin to work?'

'That depends on the light, sir; but we always work fifteen hours a day when we can get sufficient work.'

'You are a widow?'

'Yes, sir.'

'What was your husband?'

'An accountant. We lost our money in the Liberator.'

'What rent do you pay?'

'Six shillings for two rooms.'

'What does your sewing-silk and cotton cost you weekly?'

'One shilling?'

'How many journeys do you make to the City?'

Digitized by Google

'Three every week by tram. That costs us ninepence.'
And the daughter helped her mother down.

No. 6 had a blind husband and many children. Her husband lost his sight at his employment, so that she became the bread-winner. Fortunately, she says, she had learned a trade when she was young. She could make match-boxes when she was a child, so she makes them now that she is a mother. The clothing which she was wearing had been sent to her the previous day that she might appear decent. The contrast between her own dirty, evil-smelling home, with all its pestiferous environment, and that in which she found herself must have been great, but she did not seem to notice it.

The boxes which she makes were produced. She receives twopence farthing per gross for the ordinary match-boxes; and, if she works without stopping, she can make one gross in two hours. But she could not work without interruption, for the children took up some of her time. These children also helped to make match-boxes, and the day before she had kept her little boy at home to help her to finish her boxes that she might come to Stafford House. She had three very small rooms, and paid six shillings rent.

No. 7, another widow, was left with seven children, two of whom are at work but have left home. Her daughter, aged seventeen, is at home ill, and her youngest child, aged four, lies in bed, for he is unable to stand.

By trade she was a fancy-box maker, and shewed some beautiful boxes, covered with silver paper outside, and lined with enamelled paper within, to hold sweets and chocolates &c. She gets one shilling and threepence per gross for them; but for this sum she has also to make and include six strong cardboard boxes to hold each two dozen of the fancy boxes. These boxes were spotless; the keenest eye could detect no evidence of dirt. But they had been made under the most sickening conditions, and they had lain upon the miserable bed whereon lay the sick child. The

Digitized by Google

room in which she works is redolent of melted fish-glue, mingled with other and less innocent odours. In the evening all the children crowd in, and an evil-smelling paraffin lamp adds to the gloom and horror. After a time the children 'go to bed'—in the same room; but the widow goes on working until late into the night.

No. 8 is a group of three women—a mother and two daughters, in poor, black clothing, which tells of the widowhood of each. The old woman is seventy, the daughters about forty years of age. They live in Hoxton, and make 'mourning' flowers, some black, some white. 'Black Tulips' and 'Ragged Robins' are among their specialities in the black department, and thousands of widows the country over have worn flowers made by the widows of Hoxton. But the old lady devotes herself entirely to white flowers, for black tires her poor old eyes. She has her speciality too, and in her way she is an artist. With trembling hands she produced two pretty chaplets or wreaths, each composed of nearly one hundred little white flowers. Every flower has to be made separately. She has drawn the wire and twisted it to make the foundations, she has covered it neatly with white linen, she has fixed every flower in its order, and has inserted the silver leaves which have been supplied from the factory; and when she returns one dozen wreaths, made completely and throughout, she will receive one shilling and ninepence for the dozen—one penny three farthings each.

She held up another wreath; there are twenty-four pure white flowers upon it resembling camelias and beautifully made. For this she will receive twopence halfpenny, or half-a-crown for a dozen completed wreaths. They are 'confirmation wreaths,' and will be exported to Continental countries. Happy-hearted girls will wear them, the hand of the bishop will rest upon them, and God's blessing will be invoked upon the wearers; and the wreaths will be treasured as mementos of a sweetly solemn time.

But what of those who make them? Listen!

'How old are you?'

Digitized by Google

'Seventy-two.'
'Have you ever been to school?'
'No, sir.'
'How much can you earn at your work?'
'About one penny per hour.'
'You have no pay from the parish?'
'No!'
The question need not have been asked!

One of her widowed daughters out of her meagre earnings pays five shillings weekly for a single room in which she lives with her boy. Forty hours' work have to be done every week to pay for that room; food, firing, and clothing have to be worked for also, but rent comes first.

No. 9 is another widow. She is young, and her 'weeds' are fresh and new. She is a fur-sewer, making 'stoles,' sealskin and other fur jackets, &c. She has three young children, and her husband, a journeyman baker, died suddenly on Good Friday 1904. A decent, clean, and brave woman she has shewn herself; and, though her home is in Hoxton, one may safely sit and watch her 'stitch, stitch, stitch' at her stoles, jackets, or odd pieces of fur. It is hard work; every stitch must be tightly pulled through, the odd pieces must be made a complete whole, and the fur must run the right way. It is skilled work, too. She worked at fur-sewing when a girl, and continued to do so after marriage in order to supplement her husband's wages; and now that she is a widow she considers herself fortunate to have plenty of work to do, and to earn twopence per hour. She has two rooms, and pays six shillings rent. Slowly but surely the residue of the club and insurance money, left after paying for her husband's funeral, has gone, and now she finds it a difficult matter to pay her rent and feed her children—a task which will become increasingly difficult as her children grow older.

No. 10 is married to a casual labourer, who is often out of work and has proved an indifferent husband. So, with four children, the double burden has fallen upon her

Digitized by Google

shoulders. She is a machinist, and makes women's skirts, for which she gets tenpence per dozen, finding her own machine and thread. She cannot leave her young children to go to the factory, so she has an arrangement by which the unmade skirts are sent to her by carrier, and returned by her when finished by the same means. She has to pay the carriage both ways—a loss of eightpence on each transaction.

As she told the story of her hard life, she said that she often works on Sunday of necessity, and that her last holiday was fourteen years ago, when she had a day's outing with a Sunday school treat. If she could sit close at work, she might earn twopence in one hour, but not if she were interrupted, and she could not keep it up. Three-halfpence per hour would be a good average.

No. 11 is another widow. She has two children, a boy and a girl, aged ten and twelve. Her fingers had been deftly working unceasingly on materials supplied her by the manufacturer, and while the other poor women were answering questions she had earned twopence. She held up a pretty baby's bonnet, which was passed round from hand to hand and greatly admired. It was a work of art—one of her own creation. Only plain, ordinary material had been supplied to her—lace, merino, silk, and ribbon in the gross ; and now the bonnet was finished, and she had earned—twopence. The dark rings round her eyes, and the redness of those eyes, told their own story of close work and long hours ; but she makes no complaint. She will tell you that she is better paid than most home workers, and that her great anxiety is insufficiency of work, for she has 'slack times,' and then life is hard. Nevertheless, she admits that she often works long past midnight.

We should like before proceeding further to emphasize several points which the lives of these women seem to illustrate :

First, the women engaged in London home industries

Digitized by Google

are neither idle, drunken, nor dissolute, but, on the contrary, are respectable, industrious, and honest.

Secondly, sorrow and misfortune are frequently the causes which compel women, who have hitherto been in comfortable circumstances, to seek a livelihood by some kind of home work.

Thirdly, many women after marriage continue to follow these trades that they may supplement the irregular and insufficient earnings of their husbands.

Fourthly, the learning of one of these trades by girls is approved by mothers, who prefer their daughters to 'have a trade in their hands' in case anything should happen to their husbands. In fact, some branch of home work is considered a provision for the future—a kind of insurance against parish relief.

In short, the causes which lead so many women into home industries are: Early training and environment, causing even young children to become experts; early widowhood, which compels the mother to seek some work which can be done at home; insufficient earnings, or illness, of husbands; loss of money or friends by women of middle age.

There remains, however, still another class, and one which adds largely to the difficulties of the matter. The writer is acquainted with several artisans in regular work and in receipt of good wages, who are married and childless. They live in decent houses; and their wives are engaged in some kind of home industry, mantle-making, skirt-making, blouse-making, and the like. Starting with one machine on the hire-system, the business of these women extends rapidly, and other machines follow. 'Apprentices are wanted to learn the trade,' and a number of slatternly girls are soon seated at the machines. The trade is comparatively quickly learned, for it is quite automatic; these girls have then to give way to other 'apprentices,' for it would by no means pay to keep them on as 'journey-women.' They have worked two years for practically nothing, and now, at seventeen years of age, they are at liberty to set up machines on their own account in their

Digitized by Google

own homes. The woman who has taught them their trade will again provide them with work by handing over to them a portion of the work she herself can get from the factory, but which they cannot get. They are then in the hands of the sub-sweater, who, making a profit on all the work done, is not anxious that her 'outworkers' should be idle. Poor widows resort to such women; and elderly spinsters, who cannot go to the warehouse, resort to them also. Thus it comes to pass that the poor and the helpless, the aged and the infirm, are sweated by one of their more fortunate sisters. Again and again the writer has seen poor women, with sick husbands dependent upon them, engaged on blouses, at tenpence per dozen, received from the sub-sweater. One shilling per dozen was the factory price, and the twopence represented the middlewoman's profit. These blouses are, of course, cheap cotton articles, but they are made by the thousand; and we have known one hundred and eight hours worked in one week by one particular woman at this branch of work.

It may perhaps be suggested that the industries of which concrete examples have been given are not fairly representative of the home industries in London, and that some branches of work are much better paid. We would venture emphatically to maintain that the cases chosen *are* fairly representative. It is true that there are branches of work for which much better prices are paid, but these are few in number. There are also, on the other hand, numerous industries which are much worse paid than those which we have taken; and terrible indeed are the conditions of those which represent the lowest scale in connexion with the manufacture of men's and women's clothing and infants' boots and shoes.

Before dealing with the causes of sweating and the remedies proposed for its prevention, something may be said with regard to its results as reflected in the mental and physical characteristics of the sweated. Eight years ago, when the writer began his special work among these women,

Digitized by Google

he thought it would be an easy thing to stir them up to resentment and to mutiny against the conditions in which they were forced to live and to work. It is right to say that that idea has long since been abandoned. These women have no sense of injustice: their passivity is appalling and heart-rending: their wish to be let alone is unmistakeable. The one thing which frightens them is the prospect of the workhouse or of a parish funeral. Their poor little homes, sometimes dirty and wretched, but always frightfully dear, are the worlds in which they live. Their only recreation is a tramcar ride to or from the factory from which they obtain their work. It is difficult for those who have not known it to realize the conditions of a life in which farthings are of importance. Their small earnings are spent in miserable detail, excepting rent which forms a by no means miserable item in their expenditure. Their clothing is meagre and poor, their food insufficient, expensive and wasteful; for they must perforce buy in the minutest quantities. Their rooms are seldom visited by the painter or decorator; grime becomes habitual, gloom is a normal condition, dirt becomes unnoticeable, thick humid air becomes natural—and aspiration dies. A mechanical perseverance is engendered by interminable hours; and ultimately the finished product, a London home worker, is evolved, who is too often without God and without hope in the world.

A personal illustration may perhaps be permitted of the difficulties of dealing with such cases or of the endeavour to introduce a little change into the weary monotony of their lives by the provision of some place by the sea, to which such women could go for a rest, refreshment, and fresh air. By the kindness of many friends the writer was enabled to found a Home of Rest for them at Walton-on-the-Naze, and a delightful place, almost hidden by roses and other flowers, was provided. But then the difficulties began. It was astonishing to find that the sweated women made all sorts of excuses, although free railway tickets and free entertainment were provided. Here and there one or two, who were broken in health, meekly consented to go; many

Digitized by Google

firmly refused; and one, but only one, scorned the offer, not only refusing to take a holiday but bluntly declining to accept any material help. This woman was in fact the only one that the writer has met who resented the conditions under which she lived and the pay she received. She was a mantle-maker, a spinster of considerable age. A friend had authorized him to seek out a number of decent struggling elderly women, who supported themselves by some sweated trade, and to convey to them a monthly pension of ten shillings. A clergyman, who had known the woman for years, gave her name and address, in response to an inquiry for a suitable case, and she was called upon. My heart went out to her as I saw the evidences of a long-continued struggle for existence. I was so glad that it was in my power to help her. So I offered her a fortnight's holiday by the sea and a pension of ten shillings monthly afterwards. In her gloomy room I saw that she turned pale; but presently her eyes flashed, and she got up from her machine and said, 'Who gave you my name and address?' I told her. 'Have I ever asked him for anything?' 'Never,' I said. 'Neither do I ask you for anything. Please to leave my room!' I could not argue with her, so I sorrowfully went away. As she opened the street door for me, she said, 'I suppose it never occurred to the Vicar and yourself that I might be better paid for my work and charged less for my rent?' The iron had entered her soul, and her long-drawn-out grievances had made her bitter. This feeling is rare indeed, but surely it is preferable to the apathetic indifference which becomes the most noticeable feature in most of the sweated women.

A characteristic example of the latter may be given. It is that of a widowed match-box maker, presumably between fifty and sixty years of age, who lived in a poor room in a wretched street of Haggerston. In this room she had lived for fourteen years, ever since her husband's death. Two little beds, dingy and dirty, were in the room, and these were covered with match-boxes. Grime and dirt were everywhere, and the atmosphere was close and unhealthy. Her skin was like wrinkled parchment and of a

Digitized by Google

smoke-coloured hue. She continued her mechanical work while I sat and talked to her, and she proved communicative enough. Her youngest boy, she told me, now over thirteen, was born in that room; that was his bed in the corner. She did not receive parish relief and had not asked for any, for she could manage without, and was not going into the 'House.' She did not go to church or chapel—she had no time. Neither did any 'Visitors' come to see her—she did not want them. She got twopence farthing a gross for the boxes she was making—she always made the same sort. She often worked fourteen to fifteen hours a day. She had earned as much as ten shillings in a week when she worked on Sundays. She never went out, except to and from the factory—she preferred her own home. She did not know how long it was since her room had been painted and whitewashed; if she asked the landlord to do it he would put sixpence weekly on her rent, which she could hardly pay as it was.

Such was the poor thing's story with her comments. I told her of the Home Workers' Rest House by the sea, and offered to send her for a fortnight. She had no clothes! I offered to send her some clothing. There was the rent! The rent would be paid while she was away. There was the boy! He would go with her. Finally she said that she did not want to go—it was too much trouble!

This woman's state of mind is typical of the vast army of sweated women. For the mechanical perseverance which ensues from endless automatic work leaves neither energy nor thought for anything else: the power to rise above their environment is given only to the very few.

This is the worst that can be said of London's sweated women, since to their everlasting credit it must be added that, their passivity excepted, they are good women, moral, honest, and sober beyond the general standard of the community. Twenty-one years' acquaintance with the police courts and the streets of London enables the writer to affirm that few of these home-working women join the ranks of those 'whose steps lead down to hell.' In this one respect perchance endless work has been the salvation

Digitized by Google

of some. But, given thousands of women living the lives which have been described, disaster must result and two classes of people must be evolved—the joyless, apathetic automata, with hope and aspiration atrophied; and the superior class, which views without concern, nay looks upon as natural, the existence of the atrophied class living in the nether gloom. This is no imaginary danger: it is real—it is inevitable if the present conditions continue.

II.

We have given an outline of the conditions under which these sweated women live and work, and also of the reasons why women engage in such work, together with the psychological results so far as the workers themselves are concerned. We propose now to try to ascertain, if possible, the causes which lead to the sweating of women and the best methods of dealing with them.

The one great fundamental cause is the long-held belief that the labour of women is worthy of less remuneration than that of men. This holds true of many other kinds of work besides home industries; and serious results will inevitably follow in the train of our present-day movements and tendencies if women, while asserting their freedom and their equality with men, do not insist on equality of payment when the quantity and quality of their work is equal to the quantity and quality of the work done by men. Hitherto they have not insisted on this principle, and a lower rate of pay ensues. In some respects it speaks badly for women that the rate of pay in those industries which have been considered pre-eminently their own should be so abominably low. For the responsibility for this low pay is not to be laid altogether on the shoulders of the manufacturers; they have accepted a principle hitherto tacitly admitted by women themselves and utilized very largely by women in their dealings with each other. The calculations of the manufacturers have been built upon this fact, and it has been taken into account when estimating their working expenses. It is true that the manufacturers cannot be

Digitized by Google

wholly absolved, for it is only too well known how ready many of them have been to reduce without notice the insufficient payment of their outworkers; but it is of the utmost importance that women should realize that they have some responsibility in the matter, and that they must take their part in the coming struggle which is, one may hope, destined to bring about a better state of things. Since Thomas Hood wrote the *Song of the Shirt*, hundreds of other industries have developed the same conditions as those which obtained among the sempstresses; and the trades and occupations to which women are now betaking themselves will inevitably descend to a lower plane unless women themselves recognize their duty to each other and to the community generally.

But in many ways women have been helpless; and in apportioning blame it must be remembered that the sorrows of many women, and their commendable desire to maintain themselves and their fatherless children, have added to the difficulties of the case. For such one is bound to feel the greatest pity and admiration; their devotion is unquestionable, their patient perseverance unequalled, and their passive heroism almost unique. But such women are helpless, they cannot protect themselves: work they must have or perish; so they take it at any price that is offered. It seems a horrible satire to say that in a Christian country the hand of the oppressor is heaviest upon those who have the greatest claim to its pity and love—nevertheless it is true. Whatever else may be done in mitigating the evil it is profoundly to be hoped that the time may soon arrive when the widow and the fatherless shall no longer be exploited.

There comes the difficulty—to whom shall we charge the blame? Inquiry is frequently made for a 'White List' of firms, with whom purchasers may safely deal with the knowledge that their goods have been made under decent conditions and at fair prices. Other ladies have wanted a 'Black List' of firms which should be avoided. The latter alternative presents obvious difficulties, and the former is not easy to carry out on a large scale, though

Digitized by Google

the Christian Social Union has done something in this direction within a limited area. The writer has always personally refrained from complying with either request. It would be easy by a false step to make matters worse than they are at present, nor does it follow that, because articles are cheap, the producer has been insufficiently paid; for workers are frequently found earning more money upon cheap, and even shoddy, goods than they could upon superior articles. Commercial life is so mixed—so mad, one may almost say—that some of its usages and methods are bound to have serious consequences.

The 'Season' trades in particular are fraught with danger to the manufacturers and to the workers. Some details have already been given with regard to women's clothing made at tenpence per completed costume. These are made in great quantities in anticipation of a good season—Winter, Spring, or Summer. Manufacturers supply retail traders with these goods 'on sale or return.' Should the weather prove suitable for the material of which they are made, all goes well. But should it prove unsuitable, the manufacturer finds himself burdened with a large number of 'returns' and a corresponding loss, since these have to be sold off in 'job lots.' All these risks have to be taken into account by the manufacturer, and a bad season consequently means not only less work for the home-worker but also—a more serious matter—the reduction in the price paid for making the costume. It seems an extraordinary thing that one penny, in the price of a thirty-five-shilling costume, should be a matter of moment to the manufacturer; but so it is, and after a bad season it is no uncommon thing for 'shilling' costumes (*i.e.* those for the making of which a shilling is paid) to be made for elevenpence, and the elevenpenny ones to be made for tenpence. Once reduced they seldom, if ever, recover. It is much the same in other industries. It is strange that another penny paid on a gross of fountain-pen boxes would make a world of difference to the women who make them, and that we cannot get that penny to the poor workers; and strange to think that another halfpenny upon a gross

Digitized by Google

of match-boxes would make the difference between life and death to hundreds of poor families—and yet such is the case. Are prices cut so low in these two trades that this is necessary? We think not; for match firms pay good dividends, and fountain-pens are remunerative.

Under the pressure of competition, manufacturers vie with each other in granting favourable terms to retailers, and as their rents and local rates increase, the manufacturers cut down expenses to the lowest possible limit. One may suppose that there is a limit below which even a woman's costume cannot be made, but we do not appear to have found it. Neither do we appear to have found the limit to which city rents and local rates can rise. So far as the writer's own experience allows him to judge, he would say that the business of retailer is more profitable than that of manufacturer; this opinion is based upon the fact that he has known a number of manufacturers who have paid very low wages, who have lived in modest style and been incessant in their attention to business, and yet have failed to make their businesses pay, and have in old age come down to absolute poverty.

A great deal has been said and written about the evil done by woman's love of 'a bargain'; personally we do not think this has much to do with the sweating system. On the contrary, we firmly believe that the women of England will only be too glad to pay a good price for the things which they buy when they can have the assurance that the goods have been produced under good conditions and the makers fairly remunerated. The heart of humanity is sound, but the brains of the community are terribly wrong.

III.

It is comforting to find that many people have been seeking remedies for the evil. Certain definite proposals are now before the public—proposals with influential backing—which will, it is contended, eradicate, or at any rate, considerably lessen the evil. These proposals, three in number, may be described as good, bad, and indifferent.

Digitized by Google

First, there is a demand for the total abolition of all home industries by legal enactment. Employers are to be compelled to provide factory room for all their hands, and 'outwork' is to be abolished. This demand arises from Trade Unions and has the support of various organizations connected with the labour movement generally. In October last a three days' conference was held in the Guildhall and opened by the Lord Mayor of London. A number of able and influential men and women contributed papers for discussion and over three hundred duly appointed delegates were present, representing Trade Unions and the different branches of the Socialist movement. Although this conference was convened by the Anti-Sweating League, which arose out of the *Daily News* Exhibition of Sweated Industries held in May last, and the expenses were borne by the Anti-Sweating League, no delegates were allowed at the Conference except those selected by the organizations named. At the close of the third day's proceedings, a resolution was passed, without a dissentient voice being raised, calling upon the Labour members in the House of Commons to press the Government to abolish all outwork and to compel manufacturers to provide factory room for all their employées. In a sense the National Anti-Sweating League were not responsible for this resolution; but it was a foregone conclusion that, when the League limited the delegates to the Societies named, some such resolution would be passed. It was passed unanimously, and Sir Charles Dilke, we believe, spoke in favour of it. We are then compelled to face the fact that the proposal to abolish all home industries has an influential and numerous backing, and a backing by people who know what they want and are not afraid to ask for it.

The very suggestion, however, of abolishing home work fills the writer with fear and indignation. One cannot but remember the hundreds of decent women—young widows and old widows, aged spinsters and wives with sick or unfortunate or even worthless husbands—who are fighting life's battle bravely, and who, though sparsely fed and

Digitized by Google

badly housed, are, at any rate, maintaining themselves in some fashion and exhibiting qualities which no workhouse could ever develop.

Let there be no mistake. If the State adopts this proposal, the street, the workhouse, or death by starvation, will be the doom of hundreds of noble women, and our workhouses will be filled with children. For who wants a weak, timid, elderly woman as a factory employée? Manufacturers do not, neither can they be compelled to engage her. The factory hours are limited, and rightly so; the old woman's movements are not quick enough to allow her to complete her 'tale' of work in the limited hours. The factory means liability for accident; and the old are particularly liable to accidents which the prompt movements of the young enable them to escape. The factory is no ideal place for the young, but it is an impossibility for the elderly. Have these poor women no claim to consideration? Have they any right to existence? The young widow, the bravely struggling single woman whose youth is past, the mother of little children, must knock at either the factory or workhouse door, with the positive certainty that they will get a rough reception at either when the door opens to the knock. This proposal is not only bad, but inhuman and stupid.

Secondly, we have the proposal that all 'outworkers' should be licensed. This is an old friend, and has been introduced to the House of Commons before, and will probably renew the acquaintance ere long.

But even in this proposal the *factory* is to be the dominating factor. Everyone who wishes to do some kind of home work is to apply to the factory inspector for a permit. This permission, or license, does not deal with the ability of the outworker, it has no reference whatever to the remuneration the worker is to receive, it takes no note of the hours that may be worked or of the age of the worker. It proposes only to judge of the cleanliness and suitability of the room in which the work is done.

This is an indifferent proposal, more absurd than mischievous. An illustration will shew how it will act. A

Digitized by Google

poor woman applies to the factory inspector for a license to make certain articles, the material for which she would obtain from a certain factory. He visits her home, finds it small, poor, and dirty but crowded with children; the ceiling is black, the walls are rotten, and the outlook from the window is into the wretched back premises. The inspector would refuse the license because of the insanitary condition of the room. And rightly so; but herein is a marvel: the room, not fit for the manufacture of match-boxes, is still fit for human habitation, for it is crowded day and night with children and adults. It seems to us that a visit from a conscientious sanitary inspector would be more to the purpose. But the factory inspector is to be allowed to give a temporary license conditional upon the improvement of the room within a specified time. Now comes the slum landlord's chance: he knows the poor woman's extremities, he 'does it up'; but he extracts his pound of flesh by raising the rent. Clearly the licensing suggestion thus regarded is of little value.

We now come to the third suggestion—the establishment of a *minimum wage*. From this great things have been expected, and it seems to be the one good suggestion in the field.

The proposal is to establish by legal enactment some machinery for fixing the lowest price at which the work may be done whether by factory hands or outworkers. A large influential society has been formed for advocating and developing the proposal. The National Anti-Sweating League for the Establishment of a Minimum Wage is, as we have said, the outcome of the exhibition held in May, and is supported by many ladies and gentlemen of standing, knowledge, and ability. The League has an organizing secretary, and we understand that local branches are being formed in many large towns. A Bill, which is backed by Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Percy Alden, and numerous other Members of Parliament, has been drafted and will be introduced into the House of Commons in April. This Bill is, we believe, identical, or practically identical, in its pro-

Digitized by Google

posals with the methods adopted some years since in New Zealand and parts of Australia.

The object of the Bill is to provide for the establishment of Wages Boards with power to fix the minimum rate of wages to be paid in any particular trade. Power is to be given to the Home Secretary to say to what trades the Act, if it becomes an Act, shall apply. The Wages Board is to be composed of an equal number of employers and employed, not less than four nor more than ten in all, with a chairman chosen by the members, or nominated by the Home Secretary. Any six persons employed in any trade in a given district—masters or workers—may apply to the Home Secretary for the establishment of a Board. Home work is to be calculated by the piece-work system, factory work by either the hour or piece. The Bill provides for the recovery of the deficiency in cases where persons are paid at a less rate than the fixed minimum which applies to them. The date fixed for the Bill to become law is January 1, 1908—next New Year's Day.

One can readily see how this will operate among factory hands and organized trades. If approached in a friendly spirit by employers and employed it will undoubtedly make for good, for many strikes with their attendant heartburnings and sufferings will be prevented, and the advantages of a fixed rate for a given time must be obvious to employers and their workers. But the difficulty comes when its provisions are sought by poor outworkers who need its protection the most. At present the poorest-paid industries are not included in the Bill; but supposing that the Home Secretary be induced to include match-box making in the list of scheduled trades, how are these workers, generally isolated bits of humanity, to take advantage of it and get the price of match-boxes considered by a Wages Board when no Board exists? The answer, of course, is that they must combine and apply to the Home Secretary for the establishment of a Board. Combination means time, courage, and money, and match-box makers have very little of either. For some years the writer has been trying to organize the poorest classes of home-workers; and,

Digitized by Google

although more than six hundred have joined his association, he knows how difficult a thing it is. The workers are afraid, and prefer the ills they have to the ills which they imagine would arise from a movement having for its aim an increase of pay. The manufacturer, they say, is not compelled to give them work, and they know only too well that, poor as their earnings are, plenty of women are waiting for the chance of taking their places. But a Wages Board ought to accomplish some good even for match-box makers, impossible though it appears. We would suggest to the framers of the Bill that some clause be added to allow of an outside person raising the question for, and appearing on behalf of, those engaged in the poorest and unorganized industries.

But, after all, legislation will not of itself abolish the evil, though it may do much in reducing it. Good done upon compulsion has not half the beneficent effect of good done for its own sake. Though it may ultimately be necessary for the poor workers to appeal to a properly constituted court against a reduction, or for a revision, of their pay, one would a hundred times prefer that employers, without waiting for compulsion, should take into consideration the position of their workers and make up their minds that the first charge upon the manufactured goods should be an equitable payment to their workers, be they men or women, young or old.

Public feeling is becoming awakened on the subject, and the writer is bold to affirm that any manufacturer, or retailer, who can give the public an assurance that his goods are made under indisputable conditions will not only command the market but will command his own price. For this assurance the country is waiting, and the first merchant who can give it will need no other advertisement.

It is beyond dispute that sweated work has a heavy curse upon it—cursing those who make, those who sell, and those who buy. Neither does the community go scot-free, for the effect of sweating spreads like a miasma carrying death along with it. Nor does it ultimately pay: sweated

Digitized by Google

work means poor work, in which there is no love and little interest; it must pass muster, it does no more; it is of necessity inferior work, and this fact ultimately has its influence on the business of manufacturer and retailer alike—it drags them down, too.

How unwise we are! Some day perhaps we shall find that our truest wisdom will be to establish even women's work on the principles of the Sermon on the Mount; but at present we do not realize the natural and Divine truth contained in the words 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.'

IV.

Sweating cannot be tackled in its entirety without due attention to the housing of the poor, of which question it is part and parcel. We are frequently told that the best way to raise the standard of life among the poor is to raise the standard of their earnings. It is greatly to be wished that money were more plentiful among the poor, but we are convinced that the only way permanently to raise their pay is to raise the standard of their lives. The writer may claim without boasting to have almost unique opportunities of learning how the poor live, and he knows how impossible it is for many of them to have any aspirations for real life.

All their surroundings tend to depression. One great lesson is forced upon them whichever way they turn: they are not of much account in the world; anything is good enough for them. Contrast the streets of Kensington with the streets of East, North, and South London. Take notice of the cleanliness of the one and the dirt of the other. Even municipal bodies emphasize the lesson—excepting at election times. Railway companies enforce the same moral, as witness the railway stations of the West and those of East, South, and North London—any murky, dirty, uncomfortable place will serve as a station for the poor.

This lesson, as we have said, is forced upon the poor from every quarter, but it is forced upon them most of all

Digitized by Google

in their housing. In their homes they learn night and day that anything is good enough for the poor. We are of course speaking of those large masses of the London poor, the very poor, for whom as yet no provision approaching decency has been made, or attempted, either by private enterprise, municipal effort, or philanthropic trust. Decency and cleanliness, it might be thought in many slums, are not for the poor: they are the privileges of the well-to-do. The poor just rise to public expectation and not any higher. So it comes to pass that they are content with poor work, poor pay, poor food, bad air, and lack of decency. People living under these conditions fall an easy and a willing prey to the sweater. They have no power, they have no desire, to improve their environment and better their condition.

Their pay is reduced as well, without mutual arrangement between them and their employers; and, although the State has ordered that a 'list of prices' shall be exhibited prominently for the outworker to see, the State has not said that the employers shall not alter that list at will. 'That's the price I'm going to pay. Take the things or leave them as you like. I can get plenty of others to do them at the price.' So they take the work at reduced pay; it only means another hour added to the many they work daily. But the matter does not end with these workers, for they drag down to their own level of pay their unfortunate and sorrowing sisters who have not yet got used to the worst conditions of sweated life.

Decent housing is, then, an essential if sweating is to be abolished. But who is to provide it? Municipalities must have their five per cent.: philanthropic trusts must reap an equal profit; Acts and trust deeds are stringent. Private enterprise wants a good deal more, and gets it. The poorer people are, the greater the burden of rent: the greater not only in proportion to their income, but the greater in proportion to the space occupied. Multiply a three-and-sixpenny room in Hoxton or Shoreditch till it becomes a villa residence in point of space, multiply the three-and-six at the same rate; compare results, and you will find how hardly the poor are mulcted in rent.

Digitized by Google

In a Christian country one would think that people would be glad to invest their money in housing the poor and be content with three per cent. Why should it pay more than Consols? Good housing for the poor would be equally safe, for there is no prospect of the poor dying out at present. And the writer believes that such a housing project is not only not impossible but capable of being carried out in the near future; that if only public opinion can be aroused the time is at hand when the poor may be enabled to live in decency, cleanliness, and light, and when home industries will be conducted on fair principles.

We have already referred to the Home Workers' Aid Association, by which for some years an effort has been made to give rest, hope, and health to London's sweated women. Last year over three hundred of them went down to the sea and heard God's voice in the sound of many waters. The breath of God tingled in their nostrils and inflated their lungs, they paddled, they bathed, they laughed, they became again even as children. They joined in morning and evening prayers, they lay down in clean sheets, and woke with the songs of birds in their ears. They anxiously scanned the glass to see if the kiss of the sun and the caress of the wind had coloured them, and they were proud of the touch of bronze on the cheeks that had never previously known it. And they came back to London—and opened their windows.

This year, we hope that double the number of women will be able to go to their rest-house by the sea.

The association has forty poor widows, mostly with children, but some are old; to each one it says, 'Thou shalt not work on Sunday, but thou shalt keep thine house clean'; if they will fulfil these conditions a monthly pension, which even if small is a help, is allowed to them. Day trips to Epping Forest or the country, social teas and concerts, visitation of the sick, and sometimes help at death: these are the means which the Association employs to make these people realize that they are not cut off altogether from humanity.

But, after all, these are means to one great end—com-

Digitized by Google

bination for living decently and an ascent from the Inferno to reasonable life. And this includes a housing scheme for which the land has already been acquired. On twelve acres of pretty country, not far out, will be a colony of home workers. Every window will look upon a beautiful garden; every room will be lit by electric light and will be properly heated; no smoky chimney will pollute the sweet air; no filthy dustbins will stand in horrible back-yards; every set of rooms will have perfect sanitation; and no rotten plaster will line shoddy walls. In this village the inhabitants will have their own stores and their own restaurant. One clean nourishing meal every day, at a little over cost price, will be provided for them; small gas stoves will boil their kettles or cook their 'rashers' in their own kitchens. In their living rooms no unpleasant work will be done, for workrooms will be provided absolutely apart from the home and the sickly smell of paste and fish-glue, and other evil odours, will no longer be part and parcel of their home life. Nor will their 'washing' be done in their own rooms; for washhouses and drying rooms will form part of the village equipment.

The village will have its distinctive badge, and this badge will be a pledge to the world that all articles bearing its impress have been made in decency and cleanliness and paid for also with some approach to justice. Thus better prices will be obtained and fewer hours will be worked. And hope will come again into desolate hearts, and children will play and weary women will rest in the village that is to be.

It is not a mere dream of an impossible Utopia. The land is bought for this village and the money is ready for its building and equipment. Poor struggling women, who now wash their clothing at midnight and dry it in their murky rooms, are to be its inhabitants. And it is to be an object-lesson—for its foundations will be laid in justice and common-sense, and its walls builded in decency and equity. And, so builded, the writer dares to assert that it will *pay*. It will pay the kind friend who is providing the money his three per cent.; pay the manufacturers who have their

Digitized by Google

goods made in the village; and pay the public who buy those goods. But most of all, and best of all, it will pay the poor sweated women; for rest will come to them, and hope, long absent from their hearts, will revive, clean food will invigorate them, fresh air will send the blood coursing through their veins, and the merry voices of their children will be music to them.

And it is safe to assert that if it does pay it will not stand alone; for other villages will follow. The poor must combine and must be helped to combine if they are to exist. Under the present conditions, and living on the present plan, their lives are too dreadful, too wasteful, too degrading for words.

Justice, brotherly love, science and decency have scarcely as yet begun to play their part in the lives of these poor. It is not a question of setting class against class, still less is it one more scheme of pauperization under the name of philanthropy. It is an attempt to bring before the eyes of those who would help, if they only knew how, the exceeding greatness of the need and a suggestion of a method by which something may be done to cope with it on economic principles. It will be the best reward of all those who share in it to have been able to shew something of the meaning of Christian love to the downtrodden and oppressed section of the women workers of London.

THOMAS HOLMES.

Digitized by Google

ART. VII.—EURIPIDES AND HIS MODERN INTERPRETERS.

1. *Euripides the Rationalist* (1895). *Four Plays of Euripides* (1906). By A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D. (Cambridge University Press.)
2. *Euripide et l'Esprit de son Théâtre.* By PAUL DECHARME. (Paris: Garnier, 1894.)
3. *The Moral Standpoint of Euripides.* By W. H. S. JONES, of Selwyn College, Cambridge. (London: Blackie, 1906.)
4. *Translations of Euripides* (*Hippolytus, Bacchae, Troades,* &c.). By GILBERT MURRAY. (London: G. Allen, 1903–7.)
5. *Balaustion's Adventure. Aristophanes' Apology.* By ROBERT BROWNING. (London: Smith, Elder.)

THE 'sweet uses of adversity' are telling very favourably at the present time on Hellenic studies in general, and on that of the Greek drama in particular. Never, probably, has the utility of Greek been more widely questioned than it is to-day, and seldom, if ever, has the study itself been more vigorously pursued. The apparent paradox needs little or no explanation. So long as Greek was regarded as something mysterious but essential to every type of mind that could possibly be brought into touch with it, the study of it languished through being superstitiously regarded. But now that the urgent claims of science and modern languages have made themselves heard even in what are sometimes described as the antique homes of classicism, and unwise heads begin to 'despair of the Republic,' more sagacious teachers and thinkers realize that Greek will live and thrive, not as a badly enforced mystery but as a supremely rich literature. It is not, perhaps, past hope, but it is past probability, that we shall recover from Egypt, or Herculaneum, or elsewhere, the lost treasures of the Greek lyric muse. It is through lyrics that we first fall in love with our own or any other language: Wordsworth's 'lyric cry' for the discovery of some fresh 'tender-hearted scroll from pure Simonides' must have been re-echoed by many a scholar and teacher, doomed at present to teach boys Greek by fragments of

Digitized by Google

dramatic wholes which *as* fragments are apt to be desperately dull. Not enough use, perhaps, is made, for the young, of the *Anthologia*, from which an ideal book of *excerpta* might be readily compiled; such collections indeed exist, but they have not passed into the ordinary curriculum, we hardly know why. Even if they should do so, they would fall short of the lyric charm which leads on ingenuous youth, from lesser but complete poems, to the larger wholes of the epic or the drama. The most signal feature in the study of Greek literature during the last quarter of a century has been, without doubt, the rehabilitation of Euripides. It is not that his great predecessor Æschylus, and his elder contemporary Sophocles, have been thrust down from 'pride of place' or deprived of their respective crowns; nothing of the sort has happened nor seems likely to happen. But there has grown up a strong indisposition to measure the Greek dramatists by mere comparison; and the idea that Euripides is a second-rate poet, easier and therefore more fit for youthful students as a stepping-stone to higher things, is felt to be one of those quarter-truths which may well 'suffer not thinking on.' After all, and with whatever limitations we render, in English, the judgement of Aristotle that 'Euripides, faulty as he is in the general management of his subject, yet is felt to be the most tragic of poets,'[1] the *dictum* is incompatible with that half-contemptuous attitude towards the poet which so long prevailed among us, and led even men of genius astray; *pace* Mr. Swinburne, the 'most tragic of poets' was not 'a huckster of pathos whose gift was insipid ease.' The hour for awakening was bound to come, but it was attended by circumstances of special interest, and followed by a fortunate combination of critical genius and poetic gift. Nearly thirty-five years ago, the famous picture of 'Death and Heracles contending for the body of Alcestis,' and the judicious pressure of an admirer, induced Browning to translate the *Alcestis* in a setting of his own. Three years later, he followed up the adventure of Balaustion with the beautiful narrative of her later history, inserting in the course of it his version

[1] *Poetics*, c. xiii., Mr. Butcher's translation.

Digitized by Google

of the *Heracles Mainomenos*. The memorable portraiture of Aristophanes added a special interest to a volume which, owing to its learned complexities, is even now inadequately appreciated; the quaint fanaticism which led him to translate the *Agamemnon* into a sort of stiff English facsimile was of dubious service to the Greek drama, but *Balaustion's Adventure*, and *Aristophanes' Apology*, with their appended versions of two Euripidean dramas, were noble auxiliaries to the reviving fame of Euripides, after a long period of comparative depreciation. The beautiful story of the homage paid by the aged Sophocles to his dead rival is well known; but Browning's noble reproduction of it is, perhaps, less familiar than it deserves to be, owing to the mass of obscure learning in which it is embedded. The Aristophanes banquet is in full swing, with the customary derision of the absent Euripides, when 'something happens':

> 'Enters an old pale-swathed majesty,
> Makes slow mute passage through two ranks as mute . . .
> Grey brow still bent on ground, upraised at length
> When, our Priest reached, full-front the vision paused.
> "Priest!"—the deep tone succeeded the fixed gaze—
> "Thou carest that thy god have spectacle
> Decent and seemly; wherefore, I announce
> That, since Euripides is dead to-day,
> My Choros, at the Greater Feast, next month,
> Shall, clothed in black, appear ungarlanded!"
> Then the grey brow sank low, and Sophokles
> Re-swathed him, sweeping doorward: mutely passed
> Twixt rows as mute, to mingle possibly
> With certain gods who convoy age to port;
> And night resumed him.'

It is not, of course, implied that the study of Euripides had been wholly neglected in England until the early seventies of the last century. But beyond question it had been depreciated; his poetry had been regarded as specially suitable for schoolboys, as a stepping-stone to the higher things of Æschylus and Sophocles, as something useful, but comparatively easy and transitory. It was a complete misconception, and led to some results which

Digitized by Google

were not quite harmless. The *Medea* and the *Hippolytus* are noble dramas, but they are not specially well suited to early adolescence; the *Hecuba* was better, and the *Alcestis*, though, as we now know from Dr. Verrall, its real gist was unrecognized, had a simple charm which fitted it for the young. The opening scene of the *Ion* is one of the gems of Greek literature, and especially attractive to intelligent boyhood, but it was seldom put before them; the background of the story seems to have scandalized teachers of youth who saw no objection to the *Hippolytus*. The *Bacchae*, for no very obvious reason, was almost unread; so was the *Troades*. But the plain truth is that Euripides is not a very satisfactory poet for the education of the young, and quite the worst possible for being dropped at the age when we begin Sophocles or Æschylus. His theology, or anti-theology, his attitude towards the legends which he dramatizes, the background of his mind, the melancholy whisper which constantly seems to sound in our ears—*I think there are no gods, but I am sure there are not wicked ones*—the mixture in him, as Mr. Gilbert Murray excellently says, 'of unshrinking realism with unshrinking imaginativeness'—all these things mark out Euripides as definitely a poet for mature readers: *not* for ingenuous youth, which demands and deserves, above all things, a simple plot and point of view. It is fortunate, therefore, that the remarkable revival of interest in Euripides, which Browning did so much to arouse, found, before many years had elapsed, a commentator and interpreter of genius, and again, a little later, the most poetical of translators. Dr. Verrall will probably not resent our saying that his early work upon Horace, and his edition of the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus, were not free from the genial fault of speculative audacity. Like a personage in Pickwick, he rather aspired to 'make our flesh creep,' by ingenious hypotheses which, to a generation brought up on Paley's commentary, seemed not only agitating but heterodox in the extreme. In so far as they were really extravagant, we may say, in the words of the poet himself—if indeed they are his—

'Time cleanseth all things, growing old therewith.'

Digitized by Google

But, on the other hand, ingenuity of *interpretation*, in dealing with an ancient and difficult work like Æschylus' masterpiece, is far too valuable to be thrust aside in mere timidity; and indeed no small number of these apparent audacities have commended themselves more and more to common-sense, as the shock of them wore off. But a larger aspiration still, and its partial fulfilment in the two volumes, *Euripides the Rationalist* and *Four Plays of Euripides*, have made Dr. Verrall protagonist in a great cause—to wit, the recovery of the Euripidean point of view. It is clear that the poet's own generation recognized his divergence from the common creeds and national prejudices of the day; they understood that he was countermining the current conceptions, especially in the matter of religion and, to some extent, of politics. Mr. Gilbert Murray, in his excellent chapter on 'Euripides,'[1] puts the case very well, when he tells us that, alike against the orthodoxy of the day and against a shallow rationalism, Euripides is

'a solitary rebel. He is seldom frankly and outspokenly sceptical; *when he is so, it is always on moral grounds* . . . For the most part, Euripides is far from frank on these subjects. The majority of the plays draw no conclusions, but only suggest premisses. They state the religious traditions very plainly, and leave the audience to judge if it believes in them or approves of them. His work left on his contemporaries, and, if intelligently read, leaves on us, an impression of uneasy, half-disguised hostility to the supernatural element which plays so large a part in it.'

The position is so clear and comprehensible that it seems strange that so much difficulty has been found in grasping it. Many convinced theists, we presume, and many ardent Christians, stand in exactly the same attitude towards the God of Calvinism.

But in speaking of Dr. Verrall as 'protagonist' in the rehabilitation of Euripides, we allude rather to his concentration on his great theme than to anything isolated in his efforts. Of Mr. Gilbert Murray we have spoken already, and must speak of him again in his capacity of translator.

[1] *Ancient Greek Literature*, pp. 265-6.

Digitized by Google

Scholars and theologians—notably the late Bishop Westcott —have dealt with Euripides; the late John Addington Symonds has expounded, in his own flowery style but soundly and eloquently, the position of Euripides in art and literature.[1] Goethe himself not only refused his assent to the theory that Euripides caused the decline of Greek tragedy, but energetically added that 'if a modern man like Schlegel must pick out faults in so great an ancient as Euripides, he ought only to do it on his knees.' Few readers, it may be confidently hoped, fail to perceive the triple golden thread of reminiscence in the words put in the mouth of Balaustion:

> 'I know the poetess who graved in gold,
> Among her glories that shall never fade,
> This style and title for Euripides,
> *The Human with his droppings of warm tears.*'

Among recent men, Professor Paul Decharme (whose valuable work, *Euripide et l'Esprit de son Théâtre*, has been recently translated into English) is spoken of by Dr. Verrall[2] as having written 'the best treatise on the poet with which I am acquainted.' A very compendious little book of some thirty pages—*The Moral Standpoint of Euripides*—has just been published by Mr. W. H. S. Jones, of Selwyn College, Cambridge. It is full of information, but—doubtless owing to its compression—somewhat too peremptory in style.

Still, Dr. Verrall's two volumes represent a unique effort to reclaim for Euripides the place among poets which the ancient world never dreamed of denying to him, and which, in modern times, has never been conceded. As Dr. Verrall says: 'Agreeing generally, with remarkable but not surprising exactness, in their estimate of the great writers Greek and Roman, about this one man the ancient readers and the modern are out of accord.' His two volumes are a prolonged and ingenious effort to pull the balance true, by reforming our modern notions of the poet's point of view. To put the matter with the extremest

[1] *Studies of the Greek Poets*, vol. ii.
[2] *Euripides the Rationalist*, p. 81.

Digitized by Google

brevity, the dramatic legends of Greece, and especially their theological incidents, were to Euripides words and wind; things no more *true*, historically speaking, than the incidents of a dream are historical occurrences.

'The creed of Euripides' (says Dr. Verrall) 'was that of nascent philosophy, science, and rationalism; between which and the worship of the popular gods there was a war to which modern religious controversies offer no parallel. . . . . That it was the purpose and effect of his plays to destroy the old religious beliefs is repeatedly taken by Aristophanes for notorious. To dwell upon the evidence is unnecessary, as, if not quite undisputed, it is not really open to reasonable dispute . . . there is scarcely one of the extant plays which would not prove him a determined enemy of the popular theology.'

But then, on the other hand, Euripides was a poet; the stage-plays at Athens were Religion, the Press, and public opinion combined, and to abstract the theological element from these spectacles was impossible, and the attempt to do so would have been dangerous. *Fixed* belief, indeed, in these divine personalities had waned since the days of Æschylus, but reverence for a certain range of ideas, especially if they are to be embodied before the public gaze, long outlives any positive belief in the hierarchy which they are supposed to represent. Euripides had before him the hard task—if he was to be a dramatist at all—of using materials which he held to be fictitious, introducing deities in whom he totally disbelieved, and adjusting miraculous and preposterous legends to a rationalistic interpretation in which, and in which alone, he felt that possibly some reality, some basis of truth, might be found. He saw, and brilliantly exhibited, the dramatic possibilities of the legends of Alcestis and Heracles; but while with the poetic side of his nature he wrote a drama the simple pathos of which, and its happy ending, have been the joy of many generations, he would not conceal, from any intelligent Athenian, any more than he can from the scrutiny of Dr. Verrall, his real attitude towards the story of Alcestis' death and resurrection. Here as elsewhere—*e.g.* in the *Ion*, and in the *Heracles Mainomenos*—he cannot dwell in comfort,

Digitized by Google

as Æschylus and Sophocles could, with the legends he dramatized. The rationalist in him will out, in spite of all conventional and traditional beliefs: the brutality and incontinence of Apollo is not part of his creed, but his way of shewing that, to his mind, no such deity existed; that Delphi was a fraud, and Hermes a liar; and that gods (upon the stage) always come in to muffle truth, which only men and women can or will tell.

This temper of mind does, we think, remove Euripides from the company which otherwise he was so worthy to join—the company of '*serene* creators of immortal things.' Serenity, and something of 'the wise indifference of the wise,' were wanting to that impatient and saddened spirit. He could not possess his soul in patience, nor solace himself, as Shakespeare did, by concealment of his personality and creed, in the pure joy of creativeness. To Euripides, the vision of the future was dark, and the interpreters of it were a fraud:

> 'The prophet's art, I do perceive,
> Is a thing worthless, full of lying guile!
> There comes no help, no wisdom in the flare
> Of sacrifice, nor in the cry of birds!
> An idle dream it is, that fowls of air
> Can aid mankind!'

We cannot fully agree with Mr. W. H. S. Jones when he says (in the little volume already cited) that 'perhaps no literature is so pessimistic as Greek literature; certainly no Greek writer is so pessimistic as Euripides,' and gives (among other illustrations) the famous line from the *Alcestis*

> 'Life is not life, but mere calamity.'

A reference to the context disposes of the illustration with comical completeness. But we do think that the depreciation of Euripides in modern times, which Dr. Verrall speaks of so wisely in his Introduction, and combats so vigorously in both his Euripidean volumes, is in some degree due to the poet's querulous tone. It is wearisome to hear so constantly that luck is against human life. That the gods must be either knavish or non-existent may be a

M 2
Digitized by Google

sound and justifiable persuasion, but it is the fate of constant negatives that those who utter them drift into a *doctrinaire* attitude which alienates the lovers of poetry. The 'modern' depreciation of Euripides is only in part based upon his 'anti-theism': in so far as it has that basis, it deserves no particular respect and no special anathema—it is a theological judgement, not a literary one. But Dr. Verrall, who sees Euripides steadily and sees him whole, has not, we think, quite realized that the modern readers who failed to acquiesce in the poet's ancient renown, fully felt his pathos, but thought his choric odes (with a few notable exceptions) somewhat thin. Their judgement may have been wrong, but it was neither prejudiced nor, in itself, unreasonable.

We know not how much further Dr. Verrall means to carry his Euripidean 'studies.' In his first volume, *Euripides the Rationalist*, he has dealt with three complete dramas—*Alcestis*, *Ion*, *Iphigenia*—and added two supplementary studies, *Euripides in a Hymn*, and *Last Scene of All*—the latter bearing on the *Phoenissae*. Owing to the widespread familiarity of many besides professional scholars with the first-mentioned play (it has been repeatedly acted in the original language, and its echoes must ever be haunting the beautiful theatrical chalk-pit of Bradfield College!) and to the very full speculative interpretation given to it by Dr. Verrall, it is perhaps the most important of the essays. But, with its two companions, it has been before the public for ten years, and, for Euripides, has supplemented the service which *Balaustion's Adventure* began. The new volume deals with four plays—*Andromache*, *Helen*, *Heracles Mainomenos*, and *Orestes*. The first-mentioned play, in spite of some incidental beauties, has never told its own tale with any lucidity, and few will be found to doubt that Dr. Verrall is right in viewing it as explicable only on the hypothesis that it is a 'second volume,' the first having been lost, and, with it, the key by which the confused puzzle of the *Andromache* would have been plain to us. That this is so, is clear, not only in the abstract certainty that Euripides, master of subtlety as he was, never wrote a

Digitized by Google

disordered or unintelligible play, but also from the Greek 'argument' prefixed to the play and ascribed, rightly or wrongly, to Aristophanes of Alexandria. In this 'argument,' the words τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα τῶν δευτέρων seem to give a clue to the mystery. That the words should mean 'Now the play is second-rate' is almost impossible: that they mean 'The play took the second prize' is improbable, the Greek idiom to express that being well known. Dr. Verrall is clearly right in rendering the phrase, 'It is a *sequel*-play,' and explaining the situation by an ingenious parallel. To treat the *Andromache* as an independent whole is 'as if we were to expound and estimate *Catriona* . . . without knowing or suspecting that there had ever been such a story as *Kidnapped*.' But, in this case, the loss is real: we have to *imagine* the first volume of the dramatic story of *Andromache*, which Dr. Verrall re-christens *A Greek Borgia* in reference to the cool depravity of Menelaus' proceedings. The second of the four plays, known to readers of Euripides as the *Helen* but styled by Dr. Verrall, for sufficient reasons, *Euripides' Apology*, is treated in the essayist's most ingenious and imaginative style. The 'sufficient reasons' are, briefly, these. The play is, in almost every point, not only unlike, but contradictory to, the normal mood of Euripides. There is not a word against the gods; on the contrary, they all seem to be doing their not very intelligent best. Helen herself is innocent, and, in pressing circumstances, retires into a nunnery, or, to be quite exact, 'has taken up her abode in the late King Proteus' mausoleum.' The *phantom* Helen, in recovering whom Menelaus has spent long years and spilled much blood, under the illusion that she is real, is eventually brought by him to Egypt, where the real Helen is guarding herself, by seclusion, from the attentions of Theoclymenus, the late King Proteus' son. Thereon the phantom Helen, finding herself literally *de trop*, melts into air, after the necessary explanation: Menelaus and Helen borrow a ship by a ruse, from Theoclymenus, and depart for Greece, almost literally to the sound of wedding bells!

Nothing less like Euripides' other work and general

Digitized by Google

attitude of mind can possibly be conceived: yet there is not the slightest ground for doubting its authorship, and *some* explanation of Euripides' unexpected recantation of his normal point of view is certainly required. Dr. Verrall has one, so ingeniously worked out as to be almost persuasive and yet almost as pure a piece of fantasy as the phantom-Helen herself. To be brief, he thinks the *Helen*—or, as he calls it, *Euripides' Apology*—is a melodrama, a Midsummer Night's Dream, written at the request of a kind of ladies' college, in connexion with the festival of the Thesmophoria, and acted or recited before this female audience in an island (Macris or *Helene*) near the shores of Attica. Hence the unusual *piety* of the play, and the abnegation of the poet's tendency to misogyny, may be accounted for! What solid weight should be given to this ingenious speculation, *iudicent lectores*; but a more fascinating piece of constructive hypothesis and humorous guesswork we might go far to seek.

The third play, *Heracles*—re-named *A Soul's Tragedy*—is a very much grimmer piece of work, not only in the original but in the essayist's treatment of it. Euripides, he thinks, saw and sketched in Heracles a real case of a noble nature with a taint of insanity, breaking into a momentary and murderous frenzy. The delusions about his labours—only half-believed by himself—are thus accounted for from the Euripidean point of view, and subtly commented on by the essayist. Nothing, we think, in the *Heracles*, will quite justify the exordium with which Balaustion, in *Aristophanes' Apology*, preludes her recitation of this drama:

'Accordingly I read the perfect piece.'

It is *not* a perfect piece: it is something less than that, but it is a very strong and interesting effort, in a field where perhaps only Æschylus and Shakespeare have fully succeeded.

The fourth and last play—*Orestes*, otherwise *A Fire from Hell*—is, we are told (Introd. p. xi), more read than any of the other three. The special dramatic popularity of the

Digitized by Google

legends of the family of Agamemnon may account for this. The *Orestes* is a fine but lurid play, and presents the passion of revenge in an undoubtedly ugly and ferocious aspect. We are not clear that Euripides intended—as the essayist thinks he did—to describe Orestes as an infuriated young ruffian, totally without character or scruple, and Electra as a vixenish and ferocious old maid, maddened by the disgrace and disappointment of not having married! This last element in the case rouses no such emotion as Dr. Verrall feels against Euripides' Electra, when we meet it in the Electra of Sophocles. No doubt Euripides brings down emotions of this sort till they seem of the earth, earthy; that is his way, his mission, his mood. But Dr. Verrall views the passion of revenge, as exhibited by Orestes and Electra, after unexampled wrongs, not as of the earth, earthy, but as—well, in view of the title he has given to the play, let us say subterranean! It is the only case in which, amid all the ingenious audacities of his dramatic speculations, he seems momentarily to have lost the fine balance of his judgement.

We have indicated that the reviving fame of Euripides has owed, and is owing, much to an *interpreter* of genius: by the double good fortune already alluded to, he has met also with a translator of exceptional powers. Professor Murray has the advantage, which he shares with Dr. Verrall, of knowing the ground of Greek drama thoroughly, and also of writing exquisite English verse-translations, in which he does not fear to expand the letter, if thereby he can preserve the spirit, of a Greek choric ode or dramatic speech. Is it possible, *e.g.*, to put the pathos of the Chorus' lament for the doomed Phaedra (*Hippol.* ll. 762–774) more truly and more powerfully than this?—

> And for that dark spell that about her clings,
> Sick desires of forbidden things
> The soul of her rend and sever;
> The bitter tide of calamity
> Hath risen above her lips; and she
> Where bends she her last endeavour?
> She will hie her alone to her bridal room,
> And a rope swing slow in the rafters' gloom;

Digitized by Google

And a fair white neck shall creep to the noose,
A-shudder with dread, yet firm to choose
The one strait way for fame, and lose
The Love and the pain for ever.'

The farewell of Artemis to the dying Hippolytus—given by Professor Murray in the rhymed couplets which he prefers to blank verse as an equivalent for the Iambic measure—is excellent also :

'Yea, and to thee, for this sore travail's sake,
Honours most high in Troezên will I make ;
For yokeless maids before their bridal night
Shall shear for thee their tresses ; and a rite
Of honouring tears be thine in ceaseless store ;
And virgins' thoughts in music evermore
Turn toward thee, and praise thee in the Song
Of Phaedra's far-famed love and thy great wrong. .
And thou, Hippolytus, shrink not from the King,
Thy father. Thou wast born to bear this thing.
Farewell ! I may not watch man's fleeting breath,
Nor stain mine eyes with the effluence of death.
And sure that Terror now is very near.'

There is something in Mr. Gilbert Murray's verse which goes far beyond a happy knack of translation : διὰ Μούσας καὶ μετάρσιος ἦξεν would perhaps be the verdict of Euripides, borrowing a phrase of his own, on his translator.

Euripides has suffered, in life and in death, from irrational enmities and inevitable misunderstandings. Not without friction and unpopularity can any writer habitually controvert the professed creed—however lightly held—of the national audience : such a position leads to bitterness and to exile, literal or spiritual. But when the excellent mockery of Aristophanes—which is commonly taken as far more serious and malicious than it was intended to be—has said its say and laughed its laugh, the real rank of Euripides as a poet must be sought otherwhere. The great dramatic poets of the world should not be ranked as in a class-list, but viewed as a cluster of stars. Is there any reasonable canon or criterion by which Euripides can be excluded

Digitized by Google

from their company? Let the great modern poet whose appreciation has done so much for the renewal of Euripides' fame, speak the reconciling word:

> 'He lies now in the little valley, laughed
> And moaned about by those mysterious streams,
> Boiling and freezing, like the love and hate
> Which helped or harmed him through his earthly course.
> They mix in Arethousa by his grave.'

E. D. A. MORSHEAD.

ART. VIII.—THE GOSPEL HISTORY AND ITS TRANSMISSION.

1. *The Gospel History and its Transmission.* By F. CRAWFORD BURKITT, M.A., F.B.A., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.)
2. *The Human Element in the Gospels.* A Commentary on the Synoptic Narrative. By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., F.R.S., late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. Edited by NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's, and Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin. (London: John Murray, 1907.)
3. *Silanus the Christian.* By EDWIN A. ABBOTT. (London: A. & C. Black, 1906.)
4. *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons.* Von Lic. theol. Dr. phil. JOHANNES LEIPOLDT, Privatdozent an der Universität Halle-Wittenberg. Erster Teil. *Die Entstehung.* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907.)
5. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Von ADOLF HARNACK. I. *Lukas der Arzt*: der Verfasser des Dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.)

Digitized by Google

6. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Von ADOLF HARNACK. II. *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*: die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907.)
7. *Agrapha Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente.* Gesammelt und untersucht und in zweiter völlig neu bearbeiteter durch Alttestamentliche Agrapha vermehrter Auflage herausgegeben von ALFRED RESCH. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.)
8. *The Fifth Gospel.* Being the Pauline Interpretation of the Christ. By the Author of *The Faith of a Christian.* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1907.)
9. *Egypt Exploration Fund.* Report of the Twentieth Ordinary General Meeting, 1905–6. (Sold at the Offices of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 37 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.)

THE present year has already produced an unusual number of interesting works on a subject which must be of perennial and vital interest to all our readers—the Gospel History—and we propose to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded us to review modern speculation on the subject.

Mr. Burkitt's book, which we have placed at the head of our list, has all the merit which we expect from him. It is fresh, attractive, original, and reverent. Mr. Burkitt is a sincere critic and an equally sincere Christian, and he gives strong and good reasons for the reconciliation of his Christianity with his criticism. We shall find ourselves obliged to criticize some of his conclusions very frankly. He suffers, we believe, from the danger of a somewhat excessive desire for originality, which makes him underestimate the strength of old-fashioned arguments and lay undue stress on new ones. But we wish at the outset to thank him for the tone and temper of his book, and for the help which he has given us towards the great problem which has to be worked out at the present day—the reconciliation of critical freedom and religious belief.

The next two books are profoundly interesting works by two English theologians of an older generation. Dr.

Digitized by Google

Salmon's posthumous work on *The Human Element in the Gospels* shews the wonderful freshness of his intellect in his old age. He has preserved his originality, he has discarded the somewhat polemical character of his earlier works, and has attacked the Gospel problem in a purely scientific spirit. His work suffers, no doubt, from not having received his final touches; it is, perhaps, doubtful whether a third revision might not have led to further modification of his views; but it is one more proof that a clear vigorous mind may preserve its keenness and originality to the end of life. May we add that it makes one more debt that liberal learning owes to the great College of the Undivided Trinity in Dublin which the present Government desire to mutilate? In an exceedingly interesting preface Dr. Salmon notices the change which had taken place in his own methods and the advantages that he feels have been the result:

'For my own feelings, the books of the Gospels had a sacredness which Old Testament books had not; and it was painful to me to lay aside those feelings of reverence which had hitherto deterred me from too minute investigation. I felt as if I had been set to make a dissection of the body of my mother; and could not feel that the scientific value of the results I might obtain would repay me for the painful shock resulting from the very nature of the task.'

But, in spite of this, he finds the work fascinating and the result satisfactory:

'I have found nothing more interesting than this work of turning dead records into living history, as I tried to throw myself into the feelings and attitude of mind of those men of old whose story I read.'

'If I can recommend the study to others who have patience for it, it is because I consider that it gives us a firmer hold of the reality of the facts of the Gospel history.'

'The best defence of the study of the human element in the Gospels is that this human element is the real foundation of our faith. . . . We shall find that in the last resort we come to depend on the human element in the Gospels, that is to say, on things that can be proved by ordinary historical testimony.'

Digitized by Google

Dr. Abbott, from his retreat at Hampstead, continues to give us the result of his acute—perhaps over-acute—investigations.[1] His *Silanus the Christian* is a work of great interest. As literature it shews high qualities as an imaginative reconstruction of the strength and weakness of second century Stoicism. No doubt it is marred, from a literary point of view, by the mass of over-subtle speculation as to the development of the Gospel narrative with which it is burdened. No doubt, from the historical point of view, it suffers from the modernness of the speculations. No writer in the second century could have felt the critical difficulties which Dr. Abbott feels. Its real interest is the light that it throws on Dr. Abbott's own mental position. It is to us important as the best illustration of a critical and religious attitude with which we cannot agree, but from which we differ with profound respect.

Compared with these three brilliant books the German works which follow, however meritorious, are decidedly commonplace. Dr. Leipoldt's *History of the Canon* is an excellent specimen of the more sober and workmanlike German scholarship. He knows his literature, and he sums up his views clearly and succinctly. He is conservative in tone, largely indebted, we should gather, to the writings of Zahn even more than to Harnack, and he will often provide a useful corrective to Mr. Burkitt's somewhat adventurous speculation. Dr. Harnack's work on 'Luke the physician,' is really a tribute to English scholarship. It is surprising how little those who talk most glibly of scientific methods in criticism recognize where scientific methods are really to be found. It is becoming increasingly clear that the *Horae Synopticae* of Sir John Caesar Hawkins, and the patient and scientific methods of work which he follows, present the most solid contribution which recent years have made to New Testament criticism, and Dr. Harnack's aim is to

[1] Dr. Salmon's criticism on him is somewhat severe. 'A scholar of wonderful ingenuity and even more astonishing absence of common sense. He seems to have lately made considerable acquaintance with Hebrew, and, like a boy with a new knife, goes about hacking everything with it.' *The Human Element*, p. 312.

Digitized by Google

introduce these methods to German readers; yet Sir John Hawkins, who is only a retired country clergyman, has never received, so far as we are aware, any public or academic recognition, and those who are most anxious to instruct the public in scientific criticism will continue to prefer the more showy and speculative writers, who may be critical but are certainly not scientific. The second work of Dr. Harnack, an attempt to reconstruct the common stories of St. Mark and St. Luke, is much more speculative in character; but here, again, it represents a marked advance, and an attempt is made, though not, we think, very successfully, to control somewhat uncertain investigation by the more accurate methods of linguistic analysis.

The Fifth Gospel, by the author of *The Faith of a Christian*, is an attractive work which is useful for our present purpose, as it reminds us of the evidence in favour of the historical character of Christ, apart from and independent of the particular theories we may hold about the Gospel narrative.

With the assistance of these books we propose to ask what answers are being given at the present day to the following questions:

1. The formation of the Canon of the Gospels.
2. The actual date of the Gospels.
3. The materials out of which they were constructed and their historical value.
4. The bearing of these conclusions on the truth of Christianity.

I.

'There cannot be more Gospels than these four, nor can there be fewer. For as there are four regions of the world in which we live and four principal winds, and the Church is disseminated over all the world, and the Gospel is the pillar and foundation of the Church and the spirit which gives it life, it results that it must have four pillars breathing forth incorruptibility from all sides and giving life to men. . . . Fourfold are the beasts of the divine vision, fourfold is the Gospel, fourfold is the divine order. Wherefore four also were the covenants with the human race.'[1]

[1] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III. xi. 11 (ed. Harvey).

Digitized by Google

In these well-known words Irenaeus, writing shortly after the year 180, sums up for us the belief of his day concerning the Gospel canon. His arguments for the fourfold Gospel are not, perhaps, convincing in character, and some critics who have misunderstood the thought of the day have considered his testimony to be as unsubstantial as his reasoning. It is forgotten by such critics that arguments such as these do not, it is true, afford us any adequate reason for accepting only Four Gospels, but they give extremely convincing proof that Four Gospels were accepted. Irenaeus could have found equally convincing arguments in favour of three, or two, or seven Gospels, but the arguments prove that Four Gospels were already part of the ecclesiastical tradition which he defends in a manner which appealed to his own time. If Irenaeus could write like this (and his testimony is corroborated by that of all his contemporaries), it is obvious that the Four Gospels must have occupied this unique position for at least a generation, and any knowledge that we have supports this inference. So Mr. Burkitt writes:

'From about 170 A.D. onwards the Gospel Canon enjoys practically unchallenged supremacy, as we see from Tatian's Harmony, from the document known as the Muratorian Canon, and from S. Irenaeus. Somewhat earlier than Tatian must be placed an interpolated edition of the Four Gospels, which seems to have been set forth in Rome, and from which the more important "Western Interpolations" in Greek and Latin Biblical MSS. are ultimately derived. This brings us back to about 150; but the literary history of our Gospels during the first half of the second century is unknown. Justin Martyr doubtless used all the Four in Rome about the middle of the century, and Marcion certainly used Luke about 130–140. Earlier still are the allusions which indicate a use of Matthew by S. Ignatius.'

We quote these words not only because they take us back to the acceptance of the Four Gospels about 150, but because they remind us of old controversies and the advances in historical certainty which have been made by means of criticism. We remember how it was once asserted that Tatian did not know Four Gospels, and that the

Digitized by Google

Diatessaron had nothing to do with Four; how Justin was supposed to have obtained his theology from every source but the obvious one—that of St. John's Gospel; how Marcion was alleged to have used the original Luke which Catholic writers interpolated. These statements, once imposed upon us as critical certainties, seem now like phantoms of the past. By the year 150 our Four Gospels were recognized in the Church, and they were quoted as Scripture, and we can hardly feel that much stress can be laid on Mr. Burkitt's argument that Justin did not think very highly of the Gospels because he quoted them inaccurately, when we remember the character of the quotations from the Old Testament made by Christian writers from St. Paul onwards.

This, then, is our starting-point. Our Four Gospels were accepted as Scripture in the year 150. How far back can we go in the history of the New Testament Canon? We will begin by examining Mr. Burkitt's theory. It is not perhaps novel, but is stated by him with much freshness of manner. The early Christian Church, he contends, took very little interest in the historical Christ. They were concerned with eschatological speculation. The Gospels were private works, originally of little importance; no steps were taken to make Christian converts acquainted with what their Master said or did.

'No pictures,' he writes, 'of early Christianity have been conceived more fundamentally false, both to the spirit and the letter of historical fact, than those which represent S. Matthew or S. Peter as delivering catechetical lectures on the "Life of Christ."'

It was only when Docetism arose that recourse was had to the Gospels to refute the new heresy, and it was only when Marcion had constructed a New Testament Canon that the Church followed his example and made collections of the Gospels and Epistles.

Now this theory is one which we believe to be an untrue representation of the facts, whatever apparent probability it may seem to possess. Let us ask first what are Mr. Burkitt's arguments.

Digitized by Google

'But the most convincing argument against postulating a literary source behind our Mark remains to be noticed. It is this—that the hypothesis of an "Ur-Marcus" presupposes an interest in the biographical details of the public life of Jesus Christ, of which there is little trace elsewhere. In the extant remains of very early Christian literature we find the doctrines of the Crucifixion and the Resurrection; we find the arguments from prophecy; we find the ethical teaching of the Sermon on the Mount; and as early as the middle of the second century we find copious references to the stories of the Nativity. In other words, we find what corresponds to the rudiments of the Creed, together with a real and vivid interest in Christian morality. But the details of the Galilean Ministry of Jesus Christ are hardly mentioned. It is not a mere chance that the fragments of non-canonical Gospels discovered in recent years—the Oxyrhynchus *Logia* (so-called) and the Gospel of Peter—concern themselves, the one with detached sayings of Jesus, the other with the Passion.'

And again, in speaking of the *Didache*:

'But biographical interest in Christ is completely absent, even more completely absent than it is from the letters of S. Paul; for aught that appears in the *Didache*, Jesus of Nazareth might never have been crucified.'

We will deal first with the two arguments drawn from the second century. It is very remarkable that just at the same time when Professor Burkitt was delivering these lectures Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt announced the discovery of a new Gospel fragment, probably apocryphal, and probably of the second century, which completely silences his argument. Here is the account that they give in the Report of the Egypt Exploration Fund:

'The scene is at Jerusalem by the Temple; and the fragment begins with the conclusion of a speech of our Lord to His disciples, exhorting them to avoid the example of the Pharisees, and in solemn words warning them of the penalties which await the evil doer both in this world and in the next. Jesus then takes His disciples with Him inside the Temple to the place of purification, where His presence is challenged by a Pharisee, who reproaches Him for entering the sanctuary without having performed the requisite religious ceremonies of purification.

Digitized by Google

A short dialogue ensues, in which Jesus asks the Pharisee if he is pure, and the Jew answers, recounting the different religious rites for cleansing purposes, which he has observed. To this our Lord delivers an eloquent and crushing reply, contrasting outward with inward purity. In stern accents He recalls the foulness of the pools below the Temple hill, and draws a striking contrast between the outward bathing prescribed by Jewish ritual and the inward cleansing which He and His disciples have received in the waters of eternal life.'

Nor is the argument from the *Didache* of any greater value. The *Didache* is, as Mr. Burkitt reminds us, a manual of creed, practice and duty, and it is just as sound to argue from the absence of reference to the Gospel narrative in the *Didache* that the Church of the first or second century took no interest in the historical Christ as it would be to make the same deduction concerning the English Church from the Church Catechism. As a matter of fact, the *Didache* quite clearly presupposes the existence of a Gospel, to which it definitely refers. 'Neither pray as the hypocrites,' it says, 'but as the Lord commanded *in His Gospel*, thus pray ye.' And then follows the Lord's Prayer. 'And reprove another not in anger but in peace, as ye find *in the Gospel*. . . . And your praise and your almsgiving, so do ye as ye find it in *the Gospel of our Lord*.'[1] The reason, in fact, why the *Didache* does not give historical information about our Lord is that it was meant, not as a substitute for existing Gospels but as something additional to them. That is, too, the point of view from which we must look at the early Christian literature as a whole. It does not repeat the Gospel narrative, because it presupposes it. We have quite clear indication of the value attached to the words of our Lord by St. Paul.[2] We know that the narrative of the Crucifixion must have been the very basis of all Church teaching. In addition to that, it is impossible to evade the deduction which must be made from the language of St. Luke in two places. In the preface to his

[1] *The Teaching of the Apostles*, 15.

[2] On this point see Leipoldt, *Geschichte des Neutestamentliches Kanons*, p. 105.

Digitized by Google

Gospel, in well-known words, he tells Theophilus that he is going to give him more accurate information in order that he might know with certainty concerning the things in which he was instructed. Whether or no it was given by the Apostles, clearly instruction in the life of Christ was, in the opinion of St. Luke, part of what every Christian had learnt. Exactly the same impression is given by the well-known passage in the speech of St. Peter in the Acts :

'The word which He sent unto the children of Israel, preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all)—that saying ye yourselves know, which was published throughout all Judaea, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; even Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.'[1]

And then it goes on to refer to the Death and the Resurrection. Clearly this passage, whether it comes from St. Peter himself, or is only what St. Luke thought St. Peter might have said, is a decisive proof that the outline of the Gospel narrative was presupposed in the Christian teaching.

From the very beginning of Christianity, as at the present day, there have been, and always will be, two types of men. There are those who approach Christianity from the historical side, and those who approach it from the metaphysical side. To some ages the central point has been the Incarnation; to others the picture of the historical Christ has been the more attractive. No doubt St. Paul represents the one type of mind, St. Luke the other. But St. Paul's teaching presupposes narratives like those of St. Luke, and St. Luke's narrative was the basis of the teaching of his own time, just as in the time of Ignatius a narrative such as that of St. Luke was the basis of the Christian creed. We do not, therefore, in the least believe in Mr. Burkitt's one-sided conception of primitive Christianity.

It may be convenient to consider for a moment the

[1] Acts x. 36 *sq.*

Digitized by Google

parallel arguments which Mr. Burkitt uses about the collection of St. Paul's Epistles. According to him it was Marcion who first made a collection of St. Paul's Epistles:

'Marcion's edition of the Pauline Epistles very possibly represents an earlier stage of the collection of S. Paul's letters than the canonical. The history of the collection of these letters is distinct from the question of the genuineness of any or either of them. . . . It is indeed wholly uncertain how or when these letters were first brought together into a *Corpus*. I think we may fairly consider our present collection to be at least a second edition, revised and enlarged; and there is something to be said for supposing that the previous edition was due to Marcion's reverence for the great Apostle.'

He continues: 'There is clear evidence that some of the letters, especially 1 Corinthians, were known and held in great respect by writers earlier than or contemporary with Marcion. But there is no tangible evidence for an *Apostolicon*, a collection of the Epistles.' As against Mr. Burkitt's conclusion we may quote the following from Dr. Leipoldt. He writes:

'From this statement of facts we must conclude that in the sub-Apostolic period a whole series of New Testament letters was universally esteemed and made use of. It included the Epistles of Paul, especially Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, the Catholic Epistles 1 Peter and 2 John, besides the Epistle to the Hebrews. Probably there were collections of letters from which the Christians drew their knowledge of these Epistles.' [1]

It has always seemed to us that the arguments in favour of the possession by Polycarp of a collection of St. Paul's Epistles are almost conclusive. Not only does he shew an extraordinary acquaintance with them in his Epistle, but also we find him engaged in making a collection of the letters of St. Ignatius. Is it in the least reasonable to believe that the Church would busy itself with making a collection of the letters of St. Ignatius before it possessed a collection of the letters of St. Paul? We may go a step

[1] Leipoldt, *op. cit.* p. 190.

Digitized by Google

further. At the time of the Apostolic Fathers no doubt there were still reminiscences of the oral Gospel, but we know that St. Matthew's Gospel was known; we have all but conclusive evidence of the use of St. John's; we have in the *Didache* a clear reference to a written Gospel as an authority. We cannot say certainly whether or no there was a Canon of the Four Gospels, but we may, we think, conclude that there were already in the Churches authorized expositions of our Lord's life, which were regularly used. Moreover, it is well known that just at this time we begin to find books of the New Testament quoted as Scripture. It is the custom of writers like Mr. Burkitt to explain these passages away, but is that either necessary or reasonable? In New Testament times 'the Scriptures' were, of course, the Old Testament; but to St. Paul—as Dr. Leipoldt clearly writes—the words of our Lord were Scriptural authority. Only so long as the tradition was oral, it was the content and not the form which was appealed to. The Apostolic Fathers represent just the transition period, and quite naturally we find the first beginnings in the use of New Testament writings as Scripture. By the time of Justin the change is complete.[1]

We are now in a position to suggest an alternative theory for the growth of the Canon. From the earliest period of Christianity the interest in our Lord's Life, the narrative particularly of the Crucifixion, and the authority of our Lord's words, must have been supreme; but for the first generation of the Church would be dependent on an oral tradition. Written documents, if they existed, would only be subordinate in value to what was oral. How soon the narrative or the words of our Lord were read regularly in the Churches we do not know: the custom had become definite by the time of Justin. We do know that in the lifetime of St. Paul his letters were read in the Churches, and this makes it probable that, side by side with the prophetic discourse, oral or written narratives concerning our

[1] The evidence for the use of the New Testament by the Apostolic Fathers is put in a convenient form in the *Criticism of the New Testament* (St. Margaret's Lectures, 1902), pp. 183–207.

Digitized by Google

Lord's Life and words would soon be made use of. At any rate, it was on the Life and sayings of our Lord that all Christianity—Pauline or otherwise—was built up. At the end of the first century came the rise of Docetism, which, Mr. Burkitt thinks, called into existence the official use of the Gospels. We should rather hold that it was the possession of the Gospel which caused the condemnation of Docetism. Up till the beginning of the second century each Church would probably have a more or less independent tradition, corrected by the constant intercourse between Church and Church. When, owing to the religious tendencies of the times, there came, in the reign of Hadrian, a great outburst of Gnosticism, it was necessary for the Gnostics to have a written tradition to appeal to, and hence arose the mutilated or the Apocryphal Gospel and the expurgated editions of St. Paul's Epistles. It was the existence of this danger which changed the unofficial recognition by the separate Churches into the official recognition of a definite Canon. What Marcion and Marcion's contemporaries did was not to create a New Testament Canon, for that had been growing up for two generations, but to compel the Church more definitely to define the Canon and to limit its acceptance to works which could definitely, as it seemed, prove their Apostolic origin. Hence books like the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, and some of the Apocryphal Gospels which, owing to their edifying character, had been read in the Churches, came to be discarded, and the sacred books restricted to those which could properly authenticate their position.[1]

II.

We pass now to the date at which the several Gospels were written. Mr. Burkitt sums up his conclusions as follows:

'1. 30–70 A.D. Oral Period. No written "Gospel" appears

[1] Harnack puts the acceptance of the Fourfold Gospel in Asia shortly after the year 110, but connects it with an ingenious theory about

Digitized by Google

during this period, nor any formal shaping of the Gospel history as a whole. S. Paul's accounts of the Lord's Supper and of the Resurrection do not appear to have any *literary* connexion with what we read in our Gospels. To the end of this first Period we may assign the fly-sheet underlying Mk. xiii. (in Greek) and St. Matthew's Collection of Messianic Prophecies (in Hebrew).

'2. 70–110 A.D. Period of the writing of the Gospels.
Gospel of Mark, 70–80 A.D.
Gospel of Luke (and Acts), 100 A.D.
Gospel of Matthew, 90–100 A.D., in any case before 110 A.D.
Gospel of John, 100–110 A.D.'

With these dates we may compare the conclusions that Dr. Harnack arrived at in his work on the Chronology of Early Christian Literature:

'Probably 65–70. The Gospel of St. Mark.

'Probably 70–75. The Gospel according to St. Matthew, apart from certain later additions.

'78–93. The Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.

'Not after 110 and not before 80. John the Presbyter, the Gospel of John, and the three Epistles of John. Shortly afterwards the ungenuine end of St. Mark's Gospel and the completion of the Four Gospels in Asia.

It will be noticed at once that in every point the English writer places his dates later than the German Professor. Certainly Mr. Burkitt cannot be accused of erring on the side of tradition, and we would suggest certain reasons for thinking that, on the whole, the dates of Harnack are to be preferred.

To begin with the Gospel of St. Luke, concerning which we have the most definite information. Mr. Burkitt accepts the attribution of the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles to Luke the physician, the companion of St. Paul. Harnack, in the work we have already referred to,[1] has gone over the ground once more with the very greatest care, and has come definitely to the conclusion that that opinion is justified. It is difficult, we think, for

the wickedness of the elders, which seems to us purely apocryphal (see *Chronologie des Altchristlichen Literatur*, pp. 681–700).

[1] *Lukas der Arzt.*

Digitized by Google

anyone who works on the lines laid down by Sir John Hawkins, and who masters Harnack's book, to arrive at any other conclusion. But Mr. Burkitt brings in a further point: he revives and adopts the theory that St. Luke was acquainted with Josephus. The argument is reproduced from Dr. Schmiedel's articles in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, and is given by Mr. Burkitt in his fourth chapter, and we would refer our readers to the statement of it there. No doubt it is an extremely ingenious piece of work, but it entirely fails to convince us that it is true. It is to us quite inconceivable that St. Luke could have had a sufficient acquaintance with Josephus' writings to pick out by careless reading two blunders, and to have shewn so little acquaintance with the work as a whole. The unsatisfactory character of the theorem is shewn by the very laboured attempt made to justify it in Krenkel's work on the subject,[1] in which three hundred and fifty pages are devoted to supporting the thesis, and the only conclusion the reader can arrive at is that the arguments are most inadequate. We agree with Harnack and with Schürer that St. Luke was not acquainted with the writings of Josephus. What the particular cause of his mistakes—if mistakes they be—was we cannot say. It is clear that he had some source, not Josephus, from which he obtained knowledge of the history of his time. If this argument be rejected there is no need for the late date to which Mr. Burkitt would assign the Gospel, nor has it any appearance of having been written in the writer's extreme old age. Any period after the year 70, probably not very long after, will much better suit the situation. It would be possible, in fact, to throw it back a year or two earlier, though this is unlikely; but 70–90 may give reasonable limits. This, again, will throw back St. Mark's Gospel to the year 64–70, which will correspond with the tradition which represents St. Mark to have written it shortly after the death of St. Peter; for it is quite certain that St. Luke made use of St. Mark's Gospel.

[1] *Josephus und Lucas. Der schriftstellerische Einfluss des Judischen Geschichtschreibers auf den Christlichen.* Nachgewissen von Max Krenkel. (Leipzig, 1894.)

Digitized by Google

When we come to the other two Gospels we have less definite evidence to go upon. We cannot go over the ground here, but we are quite convinced that Ignatius was acquainted with both works, and this makes it extremely improbable that they were written later than the year 100.

So far as probability goes, the dates given by Dr. Harnack are more likely to be correct than those given by Mr. Burkitt. The latter is obviously always on his guard against what he imagines to be the English fault of dating Christian documents too early. We are exceedingly glad that he should accept nothing which he cannot establish conscientiously, but we are convinced that here, as elsewhere, the traditional—and, if you will, the English—dates will be established as criticism advances. The apologists, if apologists they were, who believed that Tatian and Justin knew our four Gospels or accepted the genuineness of Ignatius and Polycarp have been justified by criticism, and we are quite certain that eventually it will become clear that all our Gospels were written before the close of the first century, and that most, if not all, are the product of the second Christian generation, which lasted from 60–90 A.D.

III.

The problem of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels is as fascinating as it is elusive. For nearly a century scholars have been working at it steadily, and on only a few points has any agreement been arrived at. On one point, however, all writers are now agreed. To quote Mr. Burkitt's words, 'we are bound to conclude that Mark contains the whole of a document which Matthew and Luke have independently used, and, further, that Mark contains very little else beside': in other words, that our St. Mark's Gospel was one of the main sources of the other two. As Mr. Burkitt says: 'This conclusion is extremely important; it is the one solid contribution made by the scholarship of the nineteenth century toward the solution of the Synoptic Problem.'

Digitized by Google

It may be well to pause for a moment here and remind ourselves how clearly this statement exposes the uncertainty of a great deal of criticism. The problem which we have before us is probably insoluble. If we had Tatian's *Diatessaron* before us we might possibly have extracted the Fourth Gospel, but we could never have reconstructed, as a whole, the Synoptic Gospels. If we had had St. Matthew and St. Luke before us, and not St. Mark, it is, we think, quite clear that we could never have arrived at the contents of the second Gospel. But in these circumstances it is not surprising if any further certainty in reconstructing the source of the Gospel narrative is impossible.

Not only is the priority of St. Mark universally recognized, but the historical value of his narrative is becoming more and more clear. Mr. Burkitt emphasizes this very strongly. He shews, by a careful examination of two points—the crisis in our Lord's ministry which led to His separation from orthodox Judaism, and the relations of the narrative in St. Mark to the general history of the time—that it gives an adequate and plausible account of events. We are not certain that Mr. Burkitt's arguments are not more acute than really solid. They are, like some of Sir William Ramsay's reconstructions of the history of the Acts of the Apostles, exceedingly acute, very attractive, but yet unsubstantial. Mr. Burkitt might, we believe, have been able to make out very nearly as good a case for the Gospel of St. John as he does for that of St. Mark, if he had begun with it. At any rate, we do not think that his final conclusion is substantiated—that not only is St. Mark historical, but that it is the only good history that we have :

'If the narrative of Mark has a historical background, and in its main outlines and arrangement fits without violence into the framework of secular circumstances and events, we are not at liberty seriously to disturb the proportions of this narrative and to change its general character, in order to interpolate into it stories derived from a wholly different view of the Ministry.'

We do not think that this inference is quite justified.

Digitized by Google

St. Mark's Gospel may give us quite an adequate account of events, but not necessarily a complete one. As we shall see, the greater part of St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospels is probably derived from quite as early a source; nor are we yet convinced that the historical information given by St. John is worthless.

But as to the positive statement of the value of St. Mark we have no doubt that Mr. Burkitt's conclusion is correct. This conclusion is also shared by Dr. Salmon:

'I need not defer stating the opinion, to which my whole study of the Synoptic Gospels has led me, of the superior value of St. Mark's Gospel. . . . It is St. Mark's Gospel that must be consulted by any one who desires to know whether there was anything gradual in the process by which the attachment of His followers was gained, and the opposition of His adversaries excited.'

It is well known that tradition tells us that St. Mark was the interpreter of St. Peter, and that the Gospel which goes by his name contains the story of our Lord's Life as it was given by St. Peter. Dr. Salmon gives an ingenious and, we think, not unsatisfactory corroboration of this statement. He points out that while the preface of St. Mark contains in the first thirteen verses all the character of being an abridgment of another source, it is with the entrance of St. Peter into the narrative that the Gospel assumes its special character:

'What inclines me most to accept the statement of Papias, is the marked difference of style between the section of the Gospel which relates what happened before the calling of Peter and those which tell of what happened after it—the contrast between the meagreness of St. Mark's narrative in the one case, and its fullness in the other. In the earlier history, as told by St. Matthew and by St. Luke, we find a common element which could not have been derived from Mark, who tells the same story with so much greater brevity, that the first question we are disposed to submit to critical investigation is whether St. Mark's is more than an abridgment of an earlier narrative. But when we go on to compare the remainder of St. Mark's first chapter with the corresponding passage of Matthew, we

Digitized by Google

find the parts quite reversed: it is now St. Matthew who is the abridger, St. Mark who tells the full story.'

There is, then, one solid result of criticism so far. St. Mark's Gospel is, in its main portion, prior to St. Matthew and St. Luke, and contains an account of our Lord's ministry which has all the appearance, on critical grounds, of being historical.

But now we have the more difficult question to face of the origin of those portions of St. Matthew and St. Luke which are not contained in St. Mark. Where did they come from? What was the character of the documents from which they were derived? Here we have before us two quite separate theories. Dr. Harnack has reconstructed for us what he believes to have been the original document as a collection of the Sayings of our Lord. This theory arose first from two causes: the undoubted fact that this common source must have contained a larger proportion of discourse than St. Mark, and the misinterpretation of a statement of Papias. As this misinterpretation has become common property, it may be as well to quote what Dr. Salmon says on the subject:

'Before I part with this statement of Papias that Matthew wrote τὰ λόγια in Hebrew, it is proper to mention an inference which Schleiermacher drew from it, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, which has been fortunate enough to find more acceptance than in my opinion is deserved. He understood by τὰ λόγια a collection of our Lord's sayings, and imagined that such was the nature of the earliest Gospel. Of late years this idea has been very widely adopted. When, not long since, an Egyptian papyrus was discovered, in which many supposed utterances of our Lord were recorded, with the introduction *Jesus saith*, the leaves were generally described as taken from a collection of *Logia*, and any saying of our Lord is commonly spoken of as a *Logion*. But for this use of the word I find no authority earlier than the nineteenth century; and now it rests solely on a doubtful interpretation of an ambiguous word in an isolated extract from a lost book.'

In opposition to this theory both Mr. Burkitt and Dr. Salmon agree that the common source of St. Matthew

Digitized by Google

and St. Luke, which for convenience they call 'Q,' was a Gospel containing an account of the Crucifixion. This Gospel, according to Dr. Salmon, was the original St. Matthew, and it was used not only by the author of our St. Matthew and St. Luke but by St. Mark as well. We will quote the passage in which he gives his theory as to the composition and date of the Gospels :

'Applying now these general remarks to the criticism of the First Gospel, no reader of that Gospel can help feeling that we have in it a most precious and most authentic record of our Lord's teaching; and if we had no other Gospel, we should scarcely have ventured on a task so precarious as to attempt to discriminate between the antiquity of its various parts. But we have two other Gospels showing in many places such close affinity with St. Matthew's that we cannot help concluding that either these two made use of St. Matthew's Gospel, or else that all three drew from a common source. The latter was the conclusion to which I found myself forced to give the preference. I provisionally called that source "Q," not wishing to anticipate any conclusions to which more detailed study might lead me. Still, as there seemed to be indications that the source was Aramaic, I find it increasingly difficult to resist the conclusion that what I have called "Q" is no other than the Aramaic Matthew, to which tradition points as the earliest of the Gospel narratives.'

'These results of criticism substantially agree with all that historical testimony enables us to assert; and if they be accepted as correct, we may place the Gospel records in chronological order, as follows: First must have come the lost Aramaic by St. Matthew, which is the basis of all three Synoptics; next would come Mark, whose Greek appears to have been used both by "Matthew" and St. Luke. As between the last two, the Greek Matthew seems to show more signs of posteriority; but, until I am shown more satisfactory proof of acquaintance by either with the work of the other, I must hold that the interval between their dates of composition was not so long as to allow time for the earlier of the two to pass from being the local form in which in a particular district the history of our Saviour's life was told, to become the property of the whole Church, and thus arrive at such general circulation as necessarily to become known at a distance from its place of composition.

Digitized by Google

'It does not come within the scope of this essay to treat of the Fourth Gospel; but its Evangelist was clearly acquainted with St. Luke's Gospel; and I find no reason for being less confident about his knowledge of St. Mark's. He could hardly have been ignorant of the Aramaic Matthew, since he shows acquaintance with that language; but as to his use of the Greek Matthew, I have not yet been able to come to a positive conclusion. I find no chronological difficulty in believing that he might have known it; for both the Greek Matthew and St. John's Gospel appear to me to have been products of the same age, which may be described either as late in the Apostolic age, or early in the sub-Apostolic. I suspend my judgment on the question whether some points of coincidence between these two documents, if more than casual, are best explained by assuming the Greek editor's acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel, or *vice versa*.'

There is one third point which Mr. Burkitt and Dr. Salmon both seem to pass over. It is well known that there is a considerable section of St. Luke's Gospel, containing some of the most attractive sections in the Gospel narrative, which is peculiar to that Gospel. Is this derived from a third source or not? Our own opinion, following Dr. Sanday, is that it was: that St. Luke had at least one other document, besides those we have mentioned, before him, and that where this conflicted with his other sources he generally preferred it. The section in question has certain characteristics of its own which distinguish it from the rest of the Gospel, and this theory seems also to correspond with St. Luke's own statement in his preface. When he tells us that *many* have already undertaken to write an account of our Lord, we cannot really limit the number of histories with which he was acquainted to two. He must surely have had at least three before him, and it is possible that he may have had others.

But all these later conclusions are quite provisional. We started with one conclusion which seemed to us established; the difference of opinion which we have noted between typical investigators at the present time shews us that on no further point is there agreement. But though there is no agreement as to the form and character of the

Digitized by Google

sources of St. Matthew and St. Luke, there is agreement, both as to the value of these sources and as to the manner in which, within certain limits, the writers have used them. That St. Luke is the more historical of the two is clear: that St. Matthew arranges his material rather from the point of view of subjects than to give a continuous narrative is obvious: that both alike somewhat tone down the roughnesses and natural expressions of St. Mark is also clear: that somewhat more than the latter St. Matthew and St. Luke are influenced by the thoughts and needs of the second or third generation of Christians is natural. None of these admissions go beyond the characteristics of any historical document. Having made them, we are left with the result that the sources of St. Matthew and St. Luke, equally with St. Mark, contain an early and correct exposition of the acts and sayings of our Lord. Dr. Salmon is quite clear on this point:

'The more I study the Gospels the more convinced I am that we have in them contemporaneous history; that is to say, that we have in them the stories told of Jesus immediately after His death, and which had been circulated, and, as I am disposed to believe, put in writing while He was yet alive.'

It may be remarked that this quotation comes from his discussion of that very difficult question, the story of the Gadarene swine.

And again:

'I cannot doubt that these writings present us with the story as told in the very first assemblies of Christians, by men who had been personal disciples of Jesus; nor do I think that the account of any of our Lord's miracles would have been very different if we could have the report of it as published in a Jerusalem newspaper next morning. Of all attempts to eliminate miracle from the Gospel history the expectation to do so by historical criticism of our sources is the vainest; for it proceeds on the assumption that the first reporters were less likely than we should be now to ascribe a supernatural origin to what they had witnessed.'

Neither Mr. Burkitt nor Dr. Harnack speak quite so

Digitized by Google

definitely, but Dr. Harnack is clear that his source of St. Matthew, as he has reconstructed it, contains an historical account of our Lord's words, and a careful study of Mr. Burkitt's investigations gives us the same result.

But when we pass to St. John's Gospel the result put before us is not so reassuring. Mr. Burkitt concludes that in the Fourth Gospel 'neither the narrative nor the discussions are to be regarded as history, as matters of the past fact.' The two particular features that he examines, and on which he bases his conclusions, are the story of the raising of Lazarus, and the omission of the account of the Last Supper. With regard to the latter we may at once pass it over. It is quite certain that St. John knew of the other Gospels, and unless he had a particular reason for doing so it was not in the least necessary for him to repeat what was well known in the Church. Why he did not do so, why he attached the Eucharistic discussion rather to the feeding of the five thousand, we do not know, but there is no reflection therein upon his truthfulness as an historian. With regard to the raising of Lazarus we certainly think that Mr. Burkitt overstates the case. We have already referred to what seems to us his exaggerated claim for St. Mark, but we find the difficulties which he raises to a certain extent shared by Dr. Salmon, who writes as follows:

'Regarding, as I do, our written Gospels as but records of the narratives delivered *viva voce* by the first witnesses, I feel no distress at ordinary omissions, or discrepancies, which are sufficiently accounted for by the necessarily fragmentary character of the records of the narratives which have been preserved. Yet I do feel that the absence from the Synoptics of any mention of the raising of Lazarus is a great stumbling-block. This is an event which, according to St. John's account, made a great sensation, and which we should imagine nobody who knew of it would omit.'

We must own that we are still unconvinced, but we have not space within the limits of the present article to examine into the historical credibility of St. John. It is only our duty to report that the conclusions of Dr. Salmon and

Digitized by Google

Mr. Burkitt are unfavourable to his claims to historical narration. We are quite certain, as we have said, that Mr. Burkitt overstates the case. The judgement of Dr. Salmon appears to us more sober :

'The Fourth Evangelist seems to me to have known the localities, and to have had some trustworthy sources of information. Yet all agree that his account is later than that of the Synoptics, and I have not always confidence in accepting additions which he makes to the previously published story. The best theory I can make about him is that he was the Apostle John's "hermeneutes" and assistant, with whom that Apostle could not dispense even if he knew Greek, as he probably did. For an Eastern might be able to understand Greek, and even to speak it well enough for commercial purposes, and yet not feel himself competent to address an audience in that language.'

In a letter written recently to the *Guardian* Mr. Burkitt refers in a somewhat depreciatory way to the 'older apologetic.' We are glad for one reason that Mr. Burkitt should have felt dissatisfied with it ; it has led him to re-examine questions connected with the Gospel in a new and fresh way, and to substantiate their general historical truth by independent and often strong arguments. But we are not quite certain that eventually it will not be found that this old-fashioned apologetic with relation particularly to St. John's Gospel has a good deal more to be said for it than Mr. Burkitt thinks. After all, it is the apologetic or, as we should prefer to put it, the historical criticism of Lightfoot, and Westcott, and Hort, all men of the greatest learning, candour, and critical power—men who have been Mr. Burkitt's own teachers. It is admitted that the Fourth Gospel contains a translation of our Lord's words into the language and ideas of a later time. It may be admitted that the writer did not for the most part arrange his subject-matter in accordance with careful historical order : that if he be St. John himself his memory may have become dimmed : that in any case the theological interest was with him supreme ; but we cannot forget the long line of critics, including Renan, who have found

Digitized by Google

valuable historical information in the book. Our own investigations have found many passages which seem to illuminate the Synoptic narrative, and we do not doubt that ultimately Mr. Burkitt's criticism of the writer of the Fourth Gospel will be found to be inadequate.

IV.

There remains one final question which we must ask. What are the bearings of these criticisms and discussions on the faith of a Christian? It is no doubt a question which some of our readers have asked, and which is, at the present time, giving perplexity to some minds. We have put before our readers quite frankly the critical views of Mr. Burkitt and Dr. Salmon; we have given reasons for dissenting from them in some points, and they would be the last to claim infallibility for themselves; but the fact remains that such views are held by men who are sober critics and good Christians: that they conflict violently with the traditional beliefs of many of our readers, and may make some people ask, If our old views are overthrown in this way, what are we to believe as to the nature of Christ? Some few years ago very similar difficulties were raised concerning the Old Testament by many people; now those difficulties have largely passed away. Those who felt them have been compelled, to a certain extent, to readjust their old opinions; they have re-examined the way in which the Old Testament witnesses to revealed religion and to Christianity, and they have come to the conclusion that no criticism could by any possibility prove anything which would conflict with their belief. The existence of the Old Testament books many centuries before the beginning of Christianity is a certainty, and their witness to monotheism, to One God exalted in righteousness, to the mission of the chosen people, to the expectation of the Messiah, remains the same, whatever theory we may have as to the names of the authors of the different books, the literary character of their composition, or the development of Jewish history.

Digitized by Google

Are we yet able to say the same thing about the New Testament? All the writers we have quoted suggest that their investigations, at any rate, are independent of doctrinal difficulties.

Dr. Salmon writes:

'I did feel that I possessed this impartiality in investigating the authorship of New Testament books; because I believed that the credit of our religion was not pledged to any theory on this subject. It was no fundamental article of our faith that St. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, or that he was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Our belief in the truth of the facts recorded in the Gospels would not be affected by any uncertainty or error as to the traditional names of the compilers; because it was not on the credit of their names that our assent was given.'

So, too, Mr. Burkitt:

'I have purposely abstained in these Lectures from discussing most of those parts or features of the Gospel history which usually form the subject-matter of modern controversies. Our belief or disbelief in most of the Articles in the Apostles' Creed does not ultimately rest on historical criticism of the Gospels, but upon the general view of the universe, of the order of things, which our training and environment, or our inner experience, has led us severally to take.'

Dr. Abbott, at the beginning of his preface, writes even more strongly:

'Many years have elapsed since the author was constrained (not by *a priori* considerations but by historical and critical evidence) to disbelieve in the miraculous element of the Bible. Yet he retained the belief of his childhood and youth—rooted more firmly than before—in the eternal unity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, in the supernatural but non-miraculous incarnation of the Son as Jesus Christ, and in Christ's supernatural but non-miraculous resurrection after He had offered Himself up as a sacrifice for the sins of the world.

'The belief is commonly supposed to be rendered impossible by the disbelief. This book is written to shew that there is no such impossibility.

'The vast majority of the worshippers of Christ base their

Digitized by Google

worship to a very large extent—as the author did in his early youth under the cloud of Paley's *Evidences*—on their acceptance of His miracles as historical facts. In the author's opinion this basis is already demonstrably unsafe, and may be at any moment, by some new demonstration, absolutely destroyed.'

And, again:

'It is, however, to a third class of readers that the author mainly addresses himself. Having in view the experiences of his own early manhood, he regards with a strong fellow feeling those who desire to worship Christ and to be loyal and faithful to Him, if only they can at the same time be loyal and faithful to truth, and who doubt the compatibility of the double allegiance.

'These, many of them, cannot even conceive how they can worship Christ at the right hand of God, or the Son in the bosom of the Father in heaven, unless they first believe in Him as miraculously manifested on earth. Not being able to accept Him as miraculous, they reject Him as a Saviour. To them this book specially appeals, endeavouring to shew, in a general and popular way—on psychological, historical, and critical grounds—how the rejection of the claim made by most Christians that their Lord is miraculous, may be compatible with a frank and full acceptance of the conclusion that He is, in the highest sense, divine.'

Is the position which these writers put before us a consistent one? Let us ask ourselves for a moment on what broad line of argument we can base our belief in the Divine character of Christ. We accept it on account of the continuous relation of the Old Testament to the New, and the fulfilment of the Old in the New. We accept it for the marvellous transformation in life and thought which the earliest Christian writings present to us. We accept it for the continuous miracle of the growth and spread and history of Christianity, for the transformed views of morality and religion that it introduced, for its constant and unceasing vitality, its continuous victory and advance, for the fact of Christianity and the existence of the Christian Church at the present day. We accept it, again, because of our own religious feelings and religious

Digitized by Google

experiences. What historical basis is necessary, then, to supplement these? Quite clearly all these arguments are valid, though our ideas as to the authorship and date and even the historical credibility of many books of the New Testament were changed. But one thing, we venture to think, is necessary, and that is the picture of the Personality of Christ, as presented to us in the Gospels, and living in the thoughts of early Christianity. If that should be shewn to be baseless and untrue, we venture to think that there would be very considerable reason for despair. But so far from that being the case, all criticism tends to reassure us on the point. This is brought out very well for us by the author of *The Fifth Gospel.* He writes:

'The Gospel which Paul gave to the world can only be explained, as it is seen to be based, on historical data connected with the life and work of Jesus Christ. In the light of nineteen centuries of Christian thought and feeling, largely the result of the work which Paul accomplished in the early years of the Christian era, the greatness of Paul is unquestionable, but when we examine the Gospel which he preached, and which made him what he was, we are at every step led up to a greater personality still—the Christ of Paul's experience, the Jesus of Nazareth who was dead, but whom Paul affirmed to be alive. To account for Christianity apart from the Gospel of Paul is impossible, and to account for Paul himself apart from the historic Jesus is equally impossible.'

And, again, the same writer brings out the various different threads of tradition which help us in arriving at the Personality of Christ.

'The supreme importance which is attached to the Synoptic Gospels, as the only historical data upon which we can form a correct representation of the life and work of Jesus, is an instance of this limited view of history, which is fatal to a true interpretation of the personality of the Founder of Christianity. Without committing oneself to the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel as we now possess it, it is quite possible and reasonable to regard it as expressing the thought of John, as he looked back on what he had himself seen of that life which had been manifested, the Life which was with the Father, and

Digitized by Google

had been revealed in word and deed by the Master. It gives us a view of the personality of Jesus, not to be found in the Synoptists, but which is essential to any true explanation of the influence of Jesus, and without which the rise of Christianity is unintelligible. Similarly, there is the Gospel of Paul, the Gospel of the exalted Christ it is true, but not on that account to be regarded as destitute of historical value, for unless the story of the resurrection contained in the Synoptists is rejected simply because of its supernatural character, the relation between Paul and Jesus is as much a part of history and as essential to a true understanding of the rise of Christianity, as the other records.'

And while we have shewn that about much of the Gospel records there is sometimes difficulty and criticism, yet all our authorities combine in telling us that the general picture of the Christ given in the Synoptic Gospels is a true one. A hundred years ago there were no critical canons which enabled us to prove the authenticity of such records as the Gospels. The natural result was the extreme scepticism of the older critics. Over a century of criticism has made that impossible. A large number, if not all, of the Pauline Epistles and the Gospel narrative may now be looked upon, and may be accepted, as certain. Beyond doubt our position is very much stronger at the present day than it ever has been.

And what is the attitude of the devout Christian with regard to miracles? We cannot adopt the attitude of Paley, who could logically prove a miracle and logically deduce from a miracle the truth of Christianity. We know that the testimonies of human experience are too subtle for such methods. But we recognize, as Dr. Salmon reminds us, that the arguments against the miracles are not critical; we recognize that if we accept the truth of the Incarnation a miracle ceases to be a difficulty. To build up a logical argument able to create faith apart from religious experience is impossible; but if our faith is built up on a wide survey of facts and experience, if we are attracted by the teaching of Christ, the beauty of the Personality of Jesus of Nazareth, if we learn to accept Him as the Son of God, then the miraculous events of His

Digitized by Google

Life, from the Virgin Birth to the parting from His disciples—that Life of beneficent activity in which powers transcending those of man were never used for personal aggrandisement—take their fitting place in our scheme of history. We cannot base our belief on the formal arguments from miracles, but the record of Christ's Life in its completeness, arrived at by wise historical criticism, is a consistent and corroborative conclusion to our argument.

Art. IX.—THE RELIGIOUS CRISIS IN FRANCE: SOME PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS.

Loi du 9 Décembre 1905 concernant la Séparation des Églises et de l'État.

The development of the ecclesiastical crisis in France has been a fruitful topic of discussion and the subject of much speculation in England during the past two years. As was perhaps inevitable, the views enunciated with regard to it alike in public and in private have been coloured to a large extent by the political and religious predilections of those who have set themselves to pronounce judgement upon the issues involved, whether in the light of a more or less competent knowledge of the facts or with the aid of a not always chastened imagination. Thus in some quarters we find it regarded as the determined struggle of a free people to liberate themselves, not from the influence of their national Church but from the iron yoke of papal autocracy; to others the struggle presents itself as a revolt against sacerdotal control of any kind; while to yet others the measures adopted by the French Government represent the fruits of a policy of calculated hostility, not merely to the Catholic Church but to Religion itself. Add to this a scarcely less inevitable tendency to institute comparisons between the situation in France, thus variously regarded, and the problems actual or hypothetical with which the minds of Englishmen are more intimately concerned in

Digitized by Google

their own country, and the possibility of arriving at a true conception of the case is still further diminished.

It is admittedly difficult to be impartial in regard to a matter in which one's sympathies are deeply engaged on one side or the other, but some service at least may be done by calling attention to aspects of the situation which have scarcely received adequate recognition in England and by an examination of certain judgements which are based upon premisses only partially true or even in some cases demonstrably incorrect. As an example of our meaning we may take Canon Hensley Henson's letter to the *Times* at the beginning of the current year.[1] It is seldom our fortune to agree with Canon Henson's views in matters ecclesiastical, but no one can deny the intrepidity and vigour with which he is accustomed to deal with the questions, and they are many, which happen from time to time to engage his attention.

We propose, then, to examine first the conclusions which have led Canon Henson to condemn the Church in France. He tells us that

'without passing any judgment whatever on the political action of a neighbouring and happily friendly nation, I may say, without fear of contradiction, that the French Church has so far failed in fulfilling the grand object for which Christian Society exists, that the majority of Frenchmen have ceased to desire Christianity as the basis of national morality. The Churchman and Christian have been identical terms; and since the Church has become intolerable, it is assumed that Christianity is politically impossible.'

He goes on to state that in France

'a movement for establishing complete public control over elementary education necessarily takes an anti-Christian character.' Again: 'Education is secular in France because the majority of French citizens have been led by their experience of denominational monopoly to a disgust of Christianity itself.'

It will be observed that the writer makes four sweeping statements: (1) 'The French Church has so far failed,' as is

[1] 'France and England: a Parallel and a Contrast' (*The Times*, January 1907).

Digitized by Google

proved by (2) that 'the majority of Frenchmen have ceased to desire Christianity as the basis of national morality'; which proves (3) that since Churchman and Christian 'have been identical terms,' and 'since the Church has become intolerable, it is assumed that Christianity is politically impossible.' From the third statement it follows that

'A movement for establishing complete public control over elementary education necessarily takes an anti-Christian character,' and 'education is secular in France because the majority of French citizens have been led by their experience of denominational monopoly to a disgust of Christianity itself.'

It is at least probable that 'the majority of Frenchmen,' 'the majority of French citizens,' are unknown to Canon Hensley Henson, and that his judgement is founded either on hearsay, or on the inferences which he has drawn from the General Elections; from the return to power of the successive ministries who in their anti-Christian policy, ever in *crescendo* since 1880, have suppressed religious education in the public elementary schools; expelled the Congregations (religious orders); promoted the extinction of the majority of the schools of the Christian Brothers (Frères Chrétiens, laymen) although one of the still authorized Orders; and step by step, as convenience and occasion serve, close schools taught by others even of the very few Orders still authorized; and lastly, have broken the Concordat in a manner, as it seems to us, hardly creditable to a civilized nation. While thus freeing the State of the obligations on its side entailed by the Concordat between Napoleon I. and Pius VII., the Government imposes *nolens volens* on the thus impoverished and crippled Church as the sole condition of keeping that part of the endowments, more specially individual in its origin and purpose, as well as belonging to the Vestries, a Constitution and Associations Cultuelles framed by the State (as represented by the anti-Catholic ministry), whether suited or no to the Constitution of the Roman Catholic Church.

Digitized by Google

Canon Henson professes to pass no judgement whatever on this anti-Catholic programme, which he classifies, not without reason, as 'political'; but he condemns indirectly, unconsciously perhaps, by his assertion that the majority of the French citizens have ceased to desire Christianity as the basis of national morality.

Let us now examine the supposed inference from the General Elections; after which the personal experiences and impressions of the writer of this article will be given for what they are worth, as against, or as confirming, the possible information derived from persons unknown, or from books, newspapers, magazine articles, or reviews, by which Canon Henson may have been influenced in forming his judgements. First, it should be remembered that the misleading possibilities of inferences are peculiarly great as regards nations and classes, and notably as regards France and England. To interpret truly French elections by English electoral experiences is impossible. The self-evident fact is that the majority in every contested cause, and in every country, means obviously that the victorious party is that which has found the majority of supporters; that even if the proportion of those who take the trouble to vote leaves unrepresented a great proportion of opinions, yet it is clear that these hardly merit the designation of 'opinions,' since those who hold them have been too indifferent to vote. Despite this, it should be stated that French voters have not seldom explained to the present writer that they wished this or disapproved that, but fearing to compromise themselves decided not to vote at all rather than to risk some loss or disadvantage for themselves, or to some relation, by voting against the Government. But practically such a frame of character may be classified as indifferent where opposition is concerned. Beyond, however, the above elementary similarity in all elections, it will best be shewn how General Elections differ in France and England by sketching such characteristics as strike a transplanted Briton living wholly among the French of all classes in town

Digitized by Google

and country, and of all opinions,[1] and by suggesting the determining prepossessions in French General Elections.

First and foremost, to the mass of French voters who actually vote every consideration is secondary to the permanence of the Republic and the avoidance of war. Perhaps it should be insisted on that, to be fair, so far the mass of the people have not realized *and do not believe* that religion is or can be seriously menaced. Its organization, its administration even, may be hindered, and much that is openly recognized as unjust may be done against the Church; but the people, so far, refuse to believe that essentials are menaced: essentials to them being an open church, baptisms, first communions, marriage, extreme unction and burial by the Church. They recognize that a most effective organization, Freemasonry, is alike the enemy of the Church and the *Servante-Maîtresse* of the Government; but nevertheless the people believe that the Government will never allow such or such extreme measures; and as measures which, effectively resisted, would have been realized as extreme, have not been so resisted, the people *en masse* have accepted, and are becoming used to, revolutionary changes without being aware of their magnitude and importance. Individuals have realized, but not the mass of the people. Thus the expulsion of the Religious Orders was carried out piece by piece, having been ingeniously introduced under the pretext of reasonable State recognition, and even protection, should the State not be forced conscientiously in special cases to withhold authorization. The instructions from Rome were submission; consequently little or no resistance was offered. The sequel is now history. The Authorized Orders, with a very few exceptions, fared quite as badly as the so-called unauthorized, and in this, apart from the want of good faith, the Government was consistent, as there was no sort of difference as to moral value and devotedness of life. Again, Church school after Church school has been quietly closed in

[1] In relation to members of the present Ministry, however, this does not extend beyond their speeches and acts—their published speeches and acts.

Digitized by Google

obedience to the State. The genuinely popular manifestations against the Inventory-making of Church furniture, treasures, funds (including money received in collections, by seats, &c.), far from being initiated and encouraged by Rome, or by French ecclesiastics, was discouraged. Again, the Pope enjoined that no *émeute* or disturbance of any kind should accompany the inauguration of the post-separation *régime*. All passed, and passes quietly. The few disturbances being local and not general, the patience and self-control of Catholics is construed by the Government as indifference or even approval, and by the mass of the people, who neither see nor hear any effective protest, as a proof that, so far, no serious harm has been done to the Church or to religion, and that all will go on as before.

During the last General Election (May 1906) France was bespread with posters declaring that no Confiscation was involved in the Separation,[1] and the present writer was often assured by working men and tradespeople voters in town and country, that even had there been any such danger, the Government quite understood by the 'affaire des Inventaires' that the people would not tolerate interference with parochial Church property, the property of the fabrics included. Despite this, the impression of the transplanted Briton is that had the last General Election taken place in March 1907, after the final spoliation, the majority for the present Government would hardly have been less, since the parish churches remain open, and the functions continue as before: the suffering is the monopoly of the clergy and the very poor and helpless, and the necessities caused by the spoliation are relieved by that minority who care supremely for the things of God. *A propos* of the Inventories, it is worth recording here that the idea that the manifestations in opposition to these proceedings were the work of smart rowdies, the tools of Royalists, is an error, and an account in an English weekly newspaper of young aristocrats with orchids in their buttonholes tickled the fancy of those

[1] The *affiches*, or posters, were those of the Government candidates and included this assurance in their programme.

Digitized by Google

on the spot, who, though unable to swear that no Englishman or American lounged by or even joined in a row, can state that no Frenchmen (in the plural) so decorated resisted the inventory-making. It is rare to see a Frenchman with a flower in his buttonhole—and certainly such an occasion would not have been chosen. Probably the correspondent knew that some few years ago a Royalist (no one of any special distinction), started a white buttonhole league—but it has passed into the forgotten. But, be that as it may, we can testify to the genuineness of the manifestations, and (as at the departure of Cardinal Richard from the Archbishop's house in Paris) to the immense disproportion between the men and women, between those of the artisan and middle classes and those of the upper classes, in the crowds; the men far outnumbered the women, and the working folk their richer brethren, though all classes were represented. As for the Inventories, parish after parish in Paris and its outskirts, districts rivalling Southwark and Plaistow in squalor; districts such as those of Bethnal Green and Stepney, St. Pancras and North London, London Docks, Vauxhall, Poplar, Clerkenwell and Notting Hill; all expressed themselves energetically against the Inventory-making. The very poor, the artisans, domestic servants, shop people, clerks, came out in tough resistance; and many a curé and vicaire received their blows in sheltering the unlucky and innocent police. 'Cela ne vous regarde pas; laissez faire,' shouted a carpenter in fury at the interference of the curé in one case within our knowledge.

In a very poor district church built chiefly by the curé, but largely helped by the people, these were only kept inside the church and quiet by the curé's promise to prevent the police from entering; the working men had given up their day's work to be there, and as the curé and police exchanged *pourparlers*, shouted 'C'est de nos deniers—de nos deniers.' The curé of course was summoned and fined, but peace had been kept. The Leadenhall and Smithfield world in Paris is very independent as to the tyranny of the Bourse de Travail and also as to Church

Digitized by Google

matters. The butchers shewed themselves so ready that a curé, fearing too professional blows, agreed to accept a body guard of fifty, on condition that they pledged themselves to obedience, and to remain inside the church, where they spent the night awaiting the expected surprise visit of the Government agents. A church near the Gare du Nord was garrisoned by tradespeople and business people, shop assistants, commercial travellers and clerks; and even in the aristocratic quarters all classes were concerned. To the same prison room were consigned a young nobleman, a packer from a warehouse, and a student in a public hospital. The packer died from blood-poisoning, the result of his imprisonment when wounded in the row; he wrote to the young nobleman, asking his 'cher camarade' to come and see him. All over the country in varying degrees the manifestations shewed these same characteristics. A Parisian, in trade, explained the movement to the transplanted Briton thus:

'C'est évident d'un côté, l'expulsion des Sœurs et des religieux est une chose plus grave, et on n'a rien dit; mais, de l'autre, faire les inventaires c'est mettre la main sur les biens d'autrui, sur *nos* biens. Est-ce qu'on fait une inventaire des biens d'autrui? Du vin du voisin? De son linge? Jamais de la vie! Faire les inventaires c'était se déclarer propriétaire, ce que l'État n'avait nul droit de faire. Moi, je ne pratique pas, mais il faut respecter les idées de tout le monde, pas seulement des juifs et des franc-maçons. On nous a bien dit qu'on faisait la Séparation pour donner plus de liberté au Culte; que les choses du Culte et de la politique doivent être séparées. Bien; quelle est la première chose qu'on voit après que la loi est votée? *Accaparer les choses des églises*; faire les inventaires de nos biens; après, quoi? On attaquera nos poches! Mon Dieu! est-ce qu'après un divorce l'homme s'occupe de sa femme? se mêle de ses affaires? *Jamais!* chaqu'un va de son côté. Nous nous sommes montrés contre les Inventaires; nous ne voulions pas cela: socialisme, pur socialisme.'

Doubtless the Government understood, though, naturally, in public and by its press, it professed to consider the 'affaire des Inventaires' as clerico-political and inspired

Digitized by Google

from Rome. No one, probably, realized better than M. Briand that throughout France there was surprise and, in places, real indignation on the part of the people, which expressed itself in the manifestations and served for a time as a check, and also as a warrant to M. Briand that his intelligent comprehension that the Government might go too far was justified; and thus merely as a matter of prudence, he could claim some acquiescence in, or at least impatient watching of his policy; a desire for peace and as much approximate fairness in a campaign of destruction as should cost neither place nor power. But the Government has been kept to some extent at bay by a far weightier influence than the 'affaire des Inventaires'—by the Spirit of Unity, which makes the Church in France in its hour of material ruin strong with the strength of God. This could hardly have been anticipated, judging from the blowing of trumpets and flourishing of flags through the *Matin* (echoed in the *Times*) by M. Durand Morimbeau *alias* M. Henri des Houx. True, he never then mentioned schism; he only proclaimed the trooping in of yearning Catholics longing to be freed from Papal tyranny! But, as the *Journal des Débats* truly remarked, this glorious dawn faded away in ten numbers of the *Matin*. Not faded away: it is now shining forth in the openly schismatical Church in the confiscated Barnabite chapel, with a most irregular, so-called Bishop, and a handful of adherents, while already one of its two priests has disappeared.

Out of 60,000 French clergy some six only have been found to make *Associations cultuelles*. M. Buisson (the avowedly anti-Christian genius of the Écoles Normales, or teachers' training colleges) expressed his conviction and his hope that schism would result from *Associations cultuelles*: he expressed himself thus constantly in public, and on one particular occasion to a committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, who were considering the Separation Law as it was then before the House, *i.e.* before the law had passed. In this his hopes coincided with the fears and convictions of Professor Kuyper, as expressed in the *Journal des Debats*, February 27, 1907. Professor

Digitized by Google

Kuyper is a Professor of Theology in the Free University, Amsterdam, and a Calvinist by faith: he is also, as is well known, an ex-Prime Minister of Holland. His letter is an open one to Pasteur Lacheret of the French Églises Réformées, and laments the acceptance of the Associations Cultuelles by the French Protestants as an inevitable source of schism, and a selling of a birthright for a *potage de lentilles*. He shews in a masterly sketch how, slowly or quickly, but certainly, the spiritualty must be invaded and taken possession of by the temporality. It seems surely probable that had the Free Church of Scotland been asked on such terms to benefit by the compromise in the matter of buildings and endowments in the late *cause célèbre*, it would have indignantly refused; and the writer of this article cannot imagine similar conditions being seriously proposed to, or accepted by, the authorities of the Church of England in the event of disestablishment and disendowment. It can hardly be a matter of surprise that at the first meeting of the French Episcopate after the Separation, to the demand from Rome whether it was possible or no to accept the Separation Law such as it is, the Associations Cultuelles included, all the three Cardinals and all the Bishops, except two, voted solidly that it was not possible.

Thus, so far, the unity of the Church remaining intact, and public worship continuing, the mass of the people hardly realize any serious danger to religion in essentials; and, as in the matter of the Inventories, so lately in that of the 'Contracts' between curés and maires for the assured use for eighteen years (the longest term of communal leases) of the confiscated churches, a very large proportion of the country expressed itself on the side of the Church when it thought personal religious interests involved. As to the proposed contracts, the mayor is merely the mouthpiece of the municipal councils, of which he is chairman, and therefore it is interesting that even in such a diocese as Dijon with its Radical municipalities, out of 515 communes only seven refused their curés' proposition for a contract. In the Besançon diocese there were eight refusals out of

Digitized by Google

680. In some other dioceses there have been even fewer, in many about the same average, with here and there rather more refusals or no answers, as the officials are waiting to see how the tide flows. But the great majority all over France shewed goodwill. This is now only of interest on that account as a referendum, for M. Clémenceau's spoke in M. Briand's wheel brought the matter to a deadlock. The stipulations as to repairs were manifestly impossible, and those as to the non-employment of foreigners ridiculous—a trap too open to deceive the dullest in France; the non-employment of any of the 'regular' clergy as curés was a condition wholly outside the province of the State; and considering that before the expulsions the number of regular priests was less than 10,000, the idea of their ousting more than four times their number (curés only are here in question) is so absurd that again no French Catholic really behind the scenes and really honest on these matters would be found to subscribe to the expression of any such fear.

The goodwill as to the churches has also been shewn as to the presbyteries, so far as has been possible having regard to the fact that here it is not the municipal councils but the Prefect who has the last word in the matter; and the Prefect represents the Government. The Separation Law, in making over the presbyteries to the communes, fettered the gift by a special injunction investing the Prefect with the ultimate decision by assigning to him the approval or annulling of the decisions of the municipal councils. But for this, the presbyteries, like all other communal property, would have been independent of the Prefects. The presbyteries where Associations Cultuelles exist (as with the Protestants for instance) fall to the communes in four years—*i.e.* in 1910: where, as in the Catholic Church, there are no Associations Cultuelles they do so immediately. The consequence of allowing the ultimate decision to the Prefect, not to the municipal councils, is, that whereas in a large majority of cases the municipalities were willing to leave to the curés the free use of their houses, and in others proposed a nominal rent, the Prefects have

Digitized by Google

almost invariably overruled and insisted, not only on rent but often on high rent, which not infrequently has resulted in a homeless curé or *temporarily* in a curé-less commune. We say temporarily, since, so far, the result of such a solution in many communes has been that the distressed inhabitants have forced the mayor to make terms with the bishop and, if necessary, reparation in order to recover the curé and the open church. The Bishop of Dijon allows the writer to quote the following out of several instances in his diocese. A presbytery in very bad condition was assessed at 10*l.* a year by the municipal council for the use of three rooms in all but ruins, the outhouse where the curé kept his wood having been taken from him, and also his garden, in order to enlarge the public way. He had been curé many years, and was supposed to be much appreciated. By his bishop's orders he left the parish. In a day or two the bishop received a petition signed by three-quarters of the inhabitants declaring themselves innocent and in despair. This was followed by a visit from the mayor, driven by his weeping wife. The interview is too long to chronicle here, though from a humorous point of view it well merits a place; suffice it to say that finally the mayor declared he could not return without the promise of a re-opened church and restored curé, whom he said everyone loved! The bishop named his terms. First, that the curé should be properly lodged at the expense of the commune, and, secondly, that a fine should be paid in penitence, to be applied to the needs of the Culte. The fine was relatively heavy; the mayor groaned, then proposed that the curé should collect it, finally capitulated and departed, shaking hands with the bishop, to return with the money in a few days. The village is again in peace with a re-opened church.

In another village, where the schoolmaster rules the mayor and his colleagues, the excellent curé was expelled, and the presbytery (in good condition) let over his head. The church is closed by the same bishop. The sick and dying, and babies likely to die, receive the sacraments from an authorized neighbouring curé, and to him go the children preparing for their first communion. Lately, the

Digitized by Google

mayor applied to this curé to marry him at three o'clock P.M. in the now closed church of the commune. The curé referred him to the bishop, and to the bishop went the mayor with the confession that his future wife insisted on marriage in church. The bishop decreed that the marriage should take place in the neighbouring parish at seven o'clock in the morning, and in three minutes, *i.e.* without Mass, or music, or show of any kind. Sorrowfully the mayor retreated, but thankful even for this. The inhabitants of his commune and around are openly scornful of his disgrace, and say that he deserves it, for, indeed, the *bon curé* had not merited such treatment as expulsion after many years among them. Another curé, to whom the people were openly desirous of leaving the use of the presbytery—a course to which the municipal council, excepting the mayor, had agreed—was charged an impossible rent by command of the Prefect, who also had his adjutant in the schoolmaster. The curé instead of saying high Mass, announced from the pulpit that there would be none, and that he was leaving by order of his bishop. The congregation dispersed, and consternation possessed the village. The mayor called shortly after on the bishop, who said :

'You have been to the Lodge [*i.e.* of Freemasons], M. le Maire ?'

'Yes, Monseigneur.'

'And you received permission to come to me ?'

'Yes, Monseigneur.'

'But before you did so you went to M. le Préfet to make sure ?'

'Yes, Monseigneur.'

'And now what have you to ask ?'

'The commune is in despair and claims M. le Curé and their Mass.'

'Well, they must thank you, M. le Maire, and the schoolmaster and M. le Préfet.'

'But what can I do ?' said the Mayor; 'the commune will not stand losing their Culte.'

The bishop required the re-institution of the curé in the

Digitized by Google

presbytery at a nominal rent, and the mayor returned well content.

In another part of France a curé has been installed as caretaker at a salary of 6*l.* a year to meet the exigencies of the Prefect. In yet another part a talented curé has a standing order from the Conseil Municipal to decorate the 'Maierie,' and his salary is generous. In a department not at all expected to shew an independent spirit, the Prefect having annulled the decision of the Conseil Municipal, the said Conseil Municipal reassembled and voted the 'annullation' of the Prefect 'considérée comme nulle.' This is hardly law and order, but it shews that some of the people in France are neither wholly indifferent to the Church nor wholly content with the details of the Government legislation and the administration thereof.

If the churches were closed owing to the action of the Government, then and then only could it even approximately be judged from the next General Election for how much religion counts in France. But let there be no mistake: if the elections were given against the anti-Christian Government, against the Freemasons,[1] great indeed would be the surprise to the transplanted Briton, who realizes the hold which the Republic now has on the people, and their identification of the Republic with the Government—*i.e.*, at this time, with the extreme Republicans; and realizes also the almost irresistible machinery of Freemasonry, which sucks into its system the life of the people. This identification of the Ministry of the day, of the Government, with the Republic, is the modern version of 'l'État c'est moi' of Louis XIV.; and the centralized autocracy of Richelieu's fatal imagining now flourishes in the gross abundance of a rank, poisonous vegetation in the ever more closely centralized Government bureaucracy, spreading itself in the name of the Republic, expressing its petty tyranny under the name of Liberty, and defaming the

[1] It is hardly necessary to remind our readers that Freemasonry in France is entirely different from Freemasonry in England, and is not recognized by the latter.

Digitized by Google

fair name and ideal of a Republic by what is contrary to justice, truth, liberty, equality, fraternity.

The words 'Ancien Régime,' stripped of exaggeration, and as interpreted by that great Frenchman and philosopher, Taine, are impregnated with the pathos of something lost, something misunderstood, rather than of intentional intolerance, tyranny, cruelty, oppression, as represented in the History of France prepared for primary school education, and exaggerated even beyond this by Freemason propaganda in the country districts and in socialistic headquarters in the towns. Opportunities, it is true, were missed, lost; there were paradoxes of selfishness and self-sacrifice, of utter idleness and frivolity fostered by circumstances and changing into action and purpose when the rare occasion explained its call. The upper classes (as a rule: for to this as to all generalizations there were many exceptions), were taken up with the serious occupation of Court idleness, functions and pageantry. The middle class were busy in town and country in commerce; as *avocat* and *notaire*; as *intendants* and *fermiers-généraux*; judges and administrators generally, working from the central heads in Paris and provincial capitals. It was these men who, trained in habits of business, became and remain the parliamentarian, the administration, the executive. The lower classes under the *ancien régime*, ignored as to rights or thoughts, suffered with sublime patience, and now in France are somewhat in the position of which children have possessed themselves in the United Kingdom and the United States; in past centuries practically ignored, they are now in the twentieth century in possession of the situation, in all the vigour of raw youth and reactionary self-assertion, much increased by the weakness and ineptitude of rulers and parents, and the uncertainty as to responsibilities as well as rights, and duties as well as amusements (this applies of course to children), which seems to pervade the minds of all but the very old in the present year of grace! 'Under the *ancien régime*' really means to most people the time just before the great French Revolution; but all along, including the last centuries, the French clergy were practi-

Digitized by Google

cally, though not nominally, very much mixed up in the three classes—upper, middle, lower—and shared their social habits. Also, to a much greater extent than is often understood, the clergy mitigated the hard lot of the lowest classes, and purified the ideas and lives of the upper and middle classes. The injustices, severities, and such cruelties as there were of the *ancien régime*, were part of the *ethos* of the age, in France as elsewhere. The writer remembers Mr. Lecky insisting that this was too often forgotten, and that in France the excessive centralization of administration accounted for much.

It would be unjust to reproach Dr. Clifford with the inconsistencies of the Nonconformists who left home and all for conscience sake to inaugurate—in New England, for instance—their own Inquisition and penal laws. Is it not perhaps equally unjust to reproach the descendants of the *notaire* and *avocat*, of the *fermiers-généraux*, of the smaller professional classes, and of other less exalted representatives of the *ancien régime*, who now flourish and bear rule in France, with having learnt nothing of liberty or justice? That which now happens with regard to Government employés, especially to those serving in the Army and Navy, who were or are still Christian, is well known. The Government if not actively inquisitorial at first hand, at least encourages the system by subordinates and uses the information in a manner which answers in its effect to the old Test Act in England.

Only the present French test is '*not* to go to Mass'—and is in a day and in a country in which the rights of liberty of conscience are supposed to be understood. The writer is aware that for all this the excuse alleged is the reaction from past persecution by the Church or clerical tyranny and clericalism. From the time of the Revolution at any rate the account of the Church and its clergy certainly has its balance on the credit side, and it cannot be wondered at that the gross blasphemies and indecencies of the Revolution prejudiced the lovers of order and reverence in favour of the recovery of authority by other rulers. Under Napoleon I. there is no sign, when once the Concordat

Digitized by Google

was established, of any interference in politics by the clergy; the 'Terreur Blanche' in the hot-blooded South, after the final fall of Napoleon, was political not clerical, as is shewn by the fact that Protestants and Catholics were to be found side by side on both sides. Peace restored, under Louis XVIII., a sceptic at heart, there was no clericalism. Under Charles X. there was, but with all its narrowness and arbitrariness from a human point of view and apart from any question of morality, it would have been far preferable for peace and security to live as a *libre-penseur* under that *régime*, than for a Catholic now who is not absolutely independent of the Government in its most humble relationships.

The root of most cruelty and all arbitrariness and oppression is ignorance, fear, stupidity and cunning. And in France no doubt these influences, which shaped the errors of the past, of the *ancien régime*, are responsible for much of the errors of the present Government. Fear of losing power and place explains much; and the general degeneracy is much increased by an untrue and unreal habit of thought, bred from the doctrines of the Encyclopædists ill-digested and arbitrarily applied, and heated and endued with emotional existence by the philosophy of Rousseau.[1] But further in trying to unravel the present situation in France, it cannot sufficiently be remembered that the opportunities for mistakes and oppression are intensified and multiplied by the fatal power of centralization which nets the universal suffrage with a completeness hardly to be realized by anyone in another country. One of the most regrettable consequences of the present *régime* is the inevitable discontent and at least half-hearted tolerance of the present state of things on the part of all who have at heart the welfare of the people and the morals and integrity of public life; who care for honour and truth,

[1] The writer would venture to recommend M. Jules Lemaitre's Studies on Rousseau, lately published, as a remarkable contribution to understanding France at the present day. M. Emile Faguet's *Anti-Cléricalisme* (Société française d'Imprimerie: 15 rue Cluny, Paris) may also be suggested for perusal.

Digitized by Google

liberty, equality and fraternity; who care for their country. The sense of general dissatisfaction among the intellectual and professional classes, among men who not only have no prepossessions in favour of monarchy but also are often *libre-penseurs*, and without the faintest suspicion of clericalism; unless they be suspected, as Jules Simon tells us that he was suspected, because he resisted illiberality and denounced the name of anti-clericalism for the tool it was, a weapon forged by Gambetta, or as a war-cry, well designed to excite thoughtless passion and to appeal to prejudice. Had the Third Republic been used to develop noble ideas and love of country, to guarantee respect of conscience to all alike, how different would now be the state of France: how different the feelings for its Government. We venture to assert that the Royalist parties, insignificant as they are, would then be of the same political importance as the White Rose and Jacobite Associations in England; and this not because there are not doubtless in France many who cling with passionate affection to the names and families of those whose ancestors were served by their own ancestors, but because the French are a logical people, and had there been now a *régime* of justice and religious peace, it would have been recognized that the decision of the National Assembly in 1871 had given in the Republic liberty, justice, peace, and prosperity.

But the mass of the people have neither time to think nor to trouble themselves with details; for them the Government is the Republic, the Republic is the Government, and doubly justified in its claim on their allegiance since the Republican form of Government was decided upon in 1871–3 by the Monarchical National Assembly returned to power by universal suffrage. The mass of the people chose a Monarchical National Assembly; the said Assembly chose a President, M. Thiers, for the Third Republic. Also since the great Revolution the Monarchical experiments have failed from one cause or another, have collapsed from internal weakness or external catastrophe or both combined; and though the Republican experiments have also had their vicissitudes and trans-

Digitized by Google

formations, yet the difference is as immense in the expectations unconsciously entertained or the importance attached, as it is between the importance attached to the measles or growing pains of the young or to illness in the old; to mistakes, however grievous, in the untried or undisciplined, and to similar failures in the trained and experienced. To the present writer it seems that even if the Spectre of the *ancien régime* had not been and were not still worked unceasingly to scare the less widely read citizens of the Third Republic, the dread of war (particularly among the agricultural population), of revolution among the trades and business classes, and of disturbing the 'Caisse d'épargnes' (savings bank) and savings generally among all classes, give the re-established Republic an immense advantage. It is invested with an immense *kudos*, which means to the Ministry, the Government (now the extreme Radical party), an immense 'cover.' 'With this Government we have no war; we have had fine harvests,' is an argument repeated times without number, though it is coupled, as often as not, with regrets for such anti-Catholic legislation as may have touched the speaker's personal experience. Working men, small farmers, tradespeople, small Government *fonctionnaires* even, have freely regretted to the writer the expulsion of the 'Sœurs' from the schools, of the Religious Orders from the country (where they were locally known and especially were useful to the commune), of the ousting of the Christian Brothers in many places, as a terrible loss to primary education and in the 'professional' schools they used to hold. Regrets also are often expressed at the change in the hospitals from the kindly nuns, who tended the sick for the love of God, to the half-trained or untrained women who, in several hospitals known to the writer, refuse the smallest attentions unless paid for them. It is only fair to add that they do this because they themselves are so miserably paid that they have to eke out their income by these means indoors and by others out of doors.

As we have said, the people in general, so far as can be judged, are not blind to the consequences of the policy of

Digitized by Google

the Government. But such regrets as they express end almost invariably—we speak from experience :

'But what will you ? The Government finds it necessary : the Government has its reasons doubtless ; with this Government we have no war ; the harvests are good [this, in agricultural districts]. We are better off than before the Revolution ; the Republic is best ; the schools are better in all except religion and needlework. Manners were better, it is true. It is a pity, all the same ; they did no harm, the religious, and many did much good ; and the children were better brought up (*mieux élevés*). Now there is no discipline : they have no respect, not even for parents ; but what will you ? the Government knows best : I vote for the Government, which is the Republic.'

Reference has already been made to the influence of Franc-Maçonnerie in political life. Only by living in France among the French as a French subject, not as a passing visitor, nor even settled and resident in an English *milieu*, is it possible to realize accurately the meaning and power of Freemasonry in France. Living in France has forced the writer, contrary to former prepossessions, to realize that Freemasonry is the only perfect political organization in France (and most admirable from the point of view of machinery it is) ; and also that it is absolutely and actively anti-Christian. It is so far protected by the State, that it is the only Association tacitly sanctioned and not subject to the law for Associations (1881). So too its literature is the only literature excused from the law which requires every book, pamphlet and newspaper published, to be delivered to the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Its organization spreads like a spider's web over the whole of France. In every commune is either a responsible Freemason or adherent, who watches and reports. Through him every request has to pass to the Government bureaux ; through him every answer and favour reaches the commune. From the experience of the writer this representative of the Grand Orient is as often as not merely a discontented *mauvais sujet*, the ready tool of any machine. In towns the chief agents are the Freemasons themselves, not merely adherents, and by interest or by genuine conviction anti-Christian.

Digitized by Google

Since the Franco-Prussian war the influence of the Grand Orient has increased by leaps and bounds, and it will not be denied that it has found its support in the more Jacobin wing of the Republicans, and its protectors (not always only negatively) in Protestants and Israelites—a fact bewailed by not a few of their co-religionists. Were it only a charge made by Roman Catholics it would not be chronicled here, but the writer has heard it explained by French Protestants on the ground that 'the Freemasons are the real power of the Left and Extreme Left (Radical), and that they [the Protestants and Jews] gain more from that party than from moderate Republicans or, of course, from Conservatives. There is no question of any danger now to liberty of conscience to any but Catholics, and they now would not interfere with Protestants nor even with Israelites.'

Freemasonry has an immeasurable influence in the General, as in all, elections, and its power is not limited to the return of the deputies under its orders. Candidates of special importance such as M. Cailloux and M. Jaurès, *although known to have been beaten, to have received less votes than their opponents*, in May 1906, took their seats boldly as the lawful deputies. This was stated at the time in the French Press generally, is openly known in France, and has never been publicly denied. There is practically no redress, since in France the validity of elections is judged, as it was formerly in England, by the Chamber of Deputies itself. Thus MM. Cailloux and Jaurès decide the validity of their own elections! Only when the validity of a member of the Opposition is questioned serious steps are taken. Such a case which has lately greatly interested the French, but seems to have escaped the notice of the English press, is that of M. Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu, son of the distinguished political economist. In May 1906 he fought for and won his seat in Montpellier, as a Republican-Nationalist: *i.e.* for the Republic as a Patriot, but not with the present Government. His victory was so wholly unexpected that the campaign and the final count had been left to their natural working. At the very end of the year his election was declared invalid on the finding of a select local committee of inquiry appointed

Digitized by Google

presumably for their lack of any claim to trustworthiness or impartiality. The election had been called in question as late as might be to prevent, if possible, Leroy-Beaulieu re-presenting himself to the same list of electors. However, he was too quick and on the alert: he lost not an hour; despite unceasing anonymous threats, despite a violent assault in which his hat suffered instead of his head; despite a midnight attack (to be accurate it was 11.30 P.M.) on his return from one of his last meetings, when he was fired at and badly wounded, he persisted and again triumphantly won. The seat was supposed to be so safe for the Jacobin candidate that M. Leroy-Beaulieu's return had greatly provoked his opponents—the Freemasons above all. The would-be murderers were too gently pursued to be caught and remain comfortably at large! The class of deputy desired by the Freemasons was well described by Jules Simon in 1887:

'Now they have one qualification, because it is established that to be worthy of confidence it is only necessary to have never received any proof of confidence.[1] The art of becoming a deputy is not at all the same thing as the art of becoming a good deputy. To be a good deputy you must study in the college for political and administrative science: to be simply a deputy it is enough that your name be on the list of the committee (page 17); and who is at this moment in this country the dupe the most duped? The people! It is the universal suffrage. They say to the people, "Don't go and begin over again the tricks of the Empire, which gave you apparently the right to vote but really imposed official candidates." If they dare, the people answer: "If the Préfet has a candidate, it is just the one for whom I will not vote. I am not master to be kept in leading strings, but to choose my delegates myself, without following the orders or the advice of anyone, whosoever it may be." "See," is the reply, "here is the list we have made for you at Reims (or at Paris or at Chalons, &c.). Make sure to vote accordingly without changing . . . and when the time comes, despite all the canvassing and intrigues which will beset you, put your paper bravely in the urn to assure your power and confound your enemies." "Certainly: I shall not even look at the list. It is enough for me it is that of the Committee [Caucus]. The Com-

[1] *Nos Hommes d'État*, p. 22 (Calmann Lévy).

Digitized by Google

mittee has looked well into the matter. It has made the programme which is my programme; it is a good list; any way, it is the one I prefer. The reactionaries hoped to see me yield to my fancies; strike out one name, put in another . . . but I'll not play their game! I shall vote *en bloc* (in a lump) eyes shut, for the list of the Committee just as it is, and they will see who is master!''' [1]—'And,' Jules Simon continues (p. 15), 'So it is for all elections . . . thus we are now the property of these Committees . . . and the result is that the universal suffrage whose object was to make the people sovereign, in effect makes the people slaves.'

It is peculiarly difficult to gauge the real mind of the mass of the French people, since they seem to have less a sense of an active responsibility than of a chronic fear of not being supposed to be as good or rather better (socially) than their neighbours; of being taken advantage of; of being put upon; of some possible disadvantage or injury; and since the growing tone of the modern French schoolmaster in primary schools, the 'instituteur' (there are exceptions), cultivates this spirit, since the whole tenour of the 'Gauche' is to pander to this nervously irritable vanity, inevitably 'I shall vote eyes shut' at the orders of the Caucus of the Left (the extreme Republicans). But further, if, as has hitherto been the case, any change should break this blind following of the Government, identified mentally with the 'État,' 'the Republic,' should it come violently, the mind of the people expressed in a passion, even if in a righteous passion, cannot be said to ensure permanent good, or the result of sober reflection. It all seems reaction after reaction, with intervals of torpor in one autocracy or another. The present mental atmosphere of France strikes the observer as highly irritable and feverishly unhealthy, the only oases of self-control and purer air being among Christians and Christian centres in men and women who live near to Christ in the gracious power of His Sacramental Life. And in this time of ecclesiastical disturbance especially, it is

[1] In the *Scrutin de liste* here referred to, the elector voted for all the Deputies or Senators of the department. Now the elector votes only for the one deputy of his own *arrondissement* (division of a department or town)—votes for the name, instead of the list, ordered by the Caucus.

Digitized by Google

remarkable in bishops and clergy, in the very few remaining groups of nuns and the order of St. Vincent de Paul and Little Sisters of the Poor—in the laicized who have gathered up the fragments and bravely begun again to feed the multitude therewith. But one comes across such lay men and women in all classes; and beautiful souls among the poor, just as at home in England.

It seems inevitable that to an Englishman the elections in France should represent the will of the people deliberately moving in all anti-Catholic legislation, and among the most important, the most important in its consequences in the national life, is the 'establishing of complete public control over elementary education,' which 'necessarily takes an anti-Christian character,' because 'it is assumed that Christianity is politically impossible,' 'since the Church has become intolerable,' 'Churchman and Christian have been identical terms' and 'the majority of French citizens have been led by their experience of denominational monopoly to a disgust of Christianity itself.'

Whatever may be the grounds on which it is attempted to defend the attacks in England on denominational religion as part of the movement for establishing popular control in education, we are bold to assert that never would 'the majority of Frenchmen,' the 'majority of French citizens' in any circumstances have regarded undenominationalism as a definitely Christian religion. Sir Leslie Stephen's essay on the impossibility of unsectarian Christianity exactly expresses the clear French mind. But there is not, nor ever has been, in France 'a movement for secular education' other than that of a small body expressed and led by Jules Ferry and Paul Bert, which from being the thought of the comparatively few became the tool of Freemasonry. It is possible, though not probable, that in such unimaginable circumstances as France enjoying the richly varied spiritual diet of England, Freemasonry might have smiled at a Cowper-Temple clause conceived in the hopeful light of the dawning New Theology; but that the intellectual vanity of the most logical of nations should ever seriously tolerate and be responsible for such incoherences

Digitized by Google

is unimaginable; while, as to the Freemasons, it must be remembered that even in such incoherences they would run terribly near making the Government responsible for the recognition of God. The writer is convinced that there was no sort of popular desire in 1880 for secular education, nor has there been any general desire for its substitution for religious education. But this does not mean that there has not resulted already an immense amount of ignorance and indifference, and often, where fostered by the schoolmasters, positive hatred of Christianity.[1] But a proof that not only there was not but there is not any general popular desire for secular schools to the exclusion of religious schools lies in the fact that the religious schools still existing are full, and many to overflowing; while those reopened by the laicized hold their ground or actually increase in numbers. In a very Radical small town known to the writer this is so much the case that the re-opened laicized Christian Brothers' school gains as steadily as the secular communal school loses; in another town a small pork-butcher was bribed by offers of custom if he would send his boys to the Government school, but he refused and sends his boys to the re-opened school of the laicized Christian Brothers. An Association called 'Pères de Famille' was organized by M. Bornet of Lyons, in 1902, to defend the reconstituted voluntary schools after their destruction by M. Combes. M. Bornet was the author of a very remarkable book, *L'École libre de Demain*. In 1903 associations of the 'Pères de Famille' were founded in Lyons and around. A Congress was held and 200 associations were represented by delegates. Thirty-four thousand five hundred scholars belonged to the voluntary schools so organized. The National Congress for the Administration

[1] Jules Simon's words have already been quoted. The readers of this article are referred to a little volume, *Nos Hommes d'État* (Calmann Lévy, 1887), to an article, 'Silence aux Mères,' to another—a series—'Le Cléricalisme voilà l'ennemi,' and to the concluding series which represent (though written more than twenty years ago) what is now going on, with the exception of the last article, which represents his ideas of what might be under a Republic ruled in the faith of liberty, equality and fraternity.

Digitized by Google

of Voluntary schools met at Lyons in 1904, and the Report gives accurate details, including all that specially regards the Lyons 'Pères de Famille.' Not the least useful part of the work of this Society is watching the schoolmasters and the teaching; protesting alike against anti-Christian and anti-patriotic teaching and anti-militarism. In other parts of France known to the writer, similar associations are doing excellent work, but are less formally organized, and it is therefore doubtful if they would continue independently of their moving spirits. Secular education is, as has been said, the work of Jules Ferry and Paul Bert, and has served the Freemasons' turn admirably.[1]

There is not space here to chronicle more than a very few cases of the very many known to the writer, of the sacrifices of the working people at this juncture of their Church's fortunes. A small general shopkeeper in the north-west of France brought 40*l.* as 'tout mon possible'; a servant in a farm earning 8*l.* a year brought 3*l.*; a very poor peasant woman ten francs; a workman 4*l.*; and many more did the like—all *pour le culte* since the spoliation. In Paris a small carpenter brought five francs as a monthly subscription from *ma bourgeoise et moi*. Factory girls in another parish give a day's work once a month; a workroom elsewhere offered the earnings of a day a week. The cases in town and country known to the writer of hardly earned savings given, and daily necessities cut down even lower for the sake of the Church, prove that the hold of the Church on the people of France is firm. The transplanted Briton has been impressed by the fact that in those who believe and make efforts and sacrifices, there is no superstition whatever; it is the living Christ whom they see assailed, and the living Christ whom they serve and defend. Looking back it is wonderful that, despite the constantly disturbing influences, the shocks of revolution, the weaknesses and mistakes from within,

[1] Lately M. Maurice Barrès of the Institut de France made a remarkable speech on the urgent necessity of organization to resist the poisonous teaching of the majority of the national school teachers trained in the Écoles Normales.

Digitized by Google

the hindrances and persecutions from without, the Catholic Church in France has held on, and far from really losing ground, is able now in the hour of material ruin, to step out in increased and increasing spiritual strength. The priests are beginning to follow their bishops in the freedom of poverty out into workshop and market; field and barn; *auberge* and factory; in theatres and halls, to find the people who have from ignorance, indifference, or from fear of man, forsaken their worship, while the *Écoles normales* provide teachers who are more and more the missionaries of scepticism.

Since this was written copies of the Montagnini papers have passed from their present owners to the French Press. Doubtless there can be no dependence upon the accuracy of such copies so given—but such as they are, not a word is there which affects the opinions and statements in this article.

SOPHIA M. PALMER,
COMTESSE DE FRANQUEVILLE.

SHORT NOTICES

I.—BIBLICAL STUDIES.

The Apocalypse of St. John. The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Indices. By H. B. SWETE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (London: Macmillan, 1906.) 15s.

IN this edition of the Apocalypse Dr. Swete has followed the same plan as he adopted in editing St. Mark. He prints a continuous text with *apparatus criticus* and exegetical notes on the same page. This is the method of all the great Cambridge commentaries. Probably it is more expensive than the method of most Continental editions, which omit the text, but there can be no question that it is much pleasanter to use. The text and notes are prefaced by eighteen chapters dealing with the general questions of Introduction. Finally there is a valuable index of

Digitized by Google

Greek words, as well as one to the notes and introduction, and some instructive maps and photographs.

All these divisions—text, notes and introduction—are an advance on anything previously existing in English. They are of course scholarly in every sense, and shew that exact knowledge of Greek and philological nicety which has always been the brightest feature of English work. Naturally, however, it has the defects of its quality; so that while one is grateful for what is given, one is inclined to regret what has been withheld from a refinement of caution, and this is true of each division.

The text is probably the best which has yet been published, and the *apparatus criticus* contains information which could not easily be found elsewhere. It is perhaps a pity that Dr. Swete felt obliged in some cases to introduce a fresh notation, but the reviewer agrees that it was probably necessary to do so.[1] But it is disappointing not to be given more help towards the grouping of the authorities for the text. A reference to the works of Weiss, Bousset, Hausleiter and Gwynn, and a quotation from Dr. Hort, do not seem sufficient. No doubt the explanation is that Dr. Swete found it impossible to obtain clear-cut and certain results; but he must have noted many points of importance, and be in a position to state where the problem really lies. Can he not be induced to publish something of his views on these points?

The questions chiefly discussed at present with regard to the Apocalypse are its unity, its authorship and date. On these Dr. Swete has naturally much to say. His position may briefly be described. The writer of the Apocalypse was either the Apostle John the son of Zebedee, or John the Elder; probably the former view is preferable, but the alternative is not at present to be excluded. He wrote in the time of Domitian, and probably between 90 and 96. The Apocalypse is definitely a single complete work, and although the writer made use of any materials to which he had access he did not transfer them in such a manner

[1] It is worth pointing out that the description of Codex Kosinitsanus, on p. clxxxii, suggests a distinction between Drama and Kosinitzi. If so, this is a mistake, owing to von Soden's disregard of the traditional notation. 'Kosinitzi' (or Kosiphoinitzi) is the name generally given to a monastery in Macedonia, about twenty miles away from Drama, and perhaps a little further from Cavalla. This name probably means 'the monastery of the blackbird' (Kosouphos) and is quite old; but in official language it is called Eikosiphoinissai: whether it is original is open to question, but von Soden has adopted it and added 'Drama' in order to indicate its position.

Digitized by Google

as to make his book a 'compilation, or to detract from its unity.' These results are justified in the introduction; in each case the arguments for the result reached are carefully and impartially stated, but probably many students of the Apocalypse will feel that the arguments for different conclusions are not rendered sufficiently intelligible or always quite justly treated. As between John the Apostle and John the Elder, nothing could be more fairly stated; so much must be allowed even by those whose judgement inclines towards the view which Dr. Swete rejects. But little or nothing is said as to the possibility that the book is pseudonymous. Surely it is a point of great importance that all contemporary, and probably all existing, Apocalypses are pseudonymous. Dr. Swete seems to imply that his view that the book was written by a Christian prophet excludes this possibility here. But granting that this is true, it nevertheless remains the fact that this Christian prophet was writing in the style of a Jewish Apocalypticus, and the question is whether the name John is part of the Apocalyptic style—a pseudonym—or is genuinely intended to be taken as the name of the prophet. Does not this point require discussion quite as much as the distinction between John the Apostle and John the Elder? It does not seem quite fair to say, 'We cannot yet with safety go far beyond the dictum of Dionysius'—'that the writer of these things then is John we must believe himself when he says so; but what like is this [John] is uncertain'—when the majority of Continental writers, as well on the New Testament as on Apocalyptic literature, would consider that the dictum quoted begs the whole question.

Similar criticism is invited by Dr. Swete's treatment of the allied questions of unity of the book and the interpretation which should be given to it. His main argument in defending the unity of the Apocalypse is the occurrence of similar phrases throughout the book, and the general unity of style. To the reviewer it seems that the last argument is very strong and has often been much neglected. It gains strength if we consider the somewhat similar question of style in relation to the use of documentary sources in the Synoptic Gospels. Here the facts are much clearer, and give at least *prima facie* reason for thinking that when a first-century writer used various sources he would be likely to leave traces of the fact in variations of style. Therefore, the strongly characteristic style which can be traced throughout the Apocalypse is a valid reason for doubting the use of documentary sources. This argument has never been

Digitized by Google

stated better than by Dr. Swete. On the other hand, the exegetical argument appears to scholars of the school of Bousset to point even more strongly to the compositeness of the Apocalypse, and this argument Dr. Swete does not make sufficiently plain. In shewing the linguistic unity of the book he adopts the always instructive method of arranging the points of agreement between different parts in parallel columns; but in mentiontioning the exegetical divergences he contents himself with a list of passages (p. xlviii) and a reference to the commentary. This is regrettable, for it gives a far less clear impression of the strength of the case, and probably no one who was unacquainted with other commentaries would recognize that the fundamental question is whether the superficial evidence of style in favour of an essential unity ought to control the exegesis, or the superficial evidence of exegetical difficulties ought to control the critical judgement as to unity. Which line ought to be followed is still a problem, but those who take the former view ought to read Bousset, and those who incline to the latter will do well to study Dr. Swete. The pity of it is that each class is likely to do exactly the opposite.

If in these respects Dr. Swete's book falls short of perfection, it would give a wrong impression to end on the note of criticism when there is so much more which demands gratitude. His work is likely to remain for many years as the best English commentary, and no one, of whatever nationality, will be able to neglect it.

The Bible in Wales. A Study in the History of the Welsh People, with an Introductory Address and a Bibliography. By JOHN BALLINGER, Librarian of the Central Library, Cardiff. (London: Sotheran and Co., 1906.) By Subscription.

JUST two years ago we had occasion to review in these pages Archdeacon Thomas' scholarly *Life and Work of Bishop Davies and William Salesbury*, which dealt chiefly with the labours of the sixteenth century pioneers of Welsh Biblical translation.[1] We have now before us a work which treats of the whole history of Scriptural translation in Wales from the times of Davies and Salesbury down to the present day; while this brief but adequate historical account is supplemented by a Bibliography with notes, consisting of some ninety pages, wherein every Bible and Testament published in the Welsh language has

[1] *C.Q.R.*, April 1905. 'Translators of the Welsh Bible.'

Digitized by Google

been recorded down to the close of the year 1900. It is almost needless to add that Mr. Ballinger has carried out this task of compilation with care and thoroughness, and the Bibliography of *The Bible in Wales* will prove invaluable to the student or lecturer. The illustrations contain several facsimile reproductions of interesting letters, and also of the title pages of Salesbury's New Testament of 1567 and of Bishop Morgan's Bible of 1588, and of other exceedingly rare Welsh books.

The first extant printed translation of any portion of the Bible is connected with a name little known outside the Principality, that of Sir John Prys, or Prise, of Brecon, whose 'Welsh Calendar' of 1546 contains the Lord's Prayer, the Decalogue and three verses from the New Testament in his native tongue. The second printed translation of 1551, known as the *Llith a ban* and consisting of the Gospels and Epistles of the Prayer Book, is from the pen of William Salesbury, the chief translator of the New Testament of 1567. In 1588 Bishop William Morgan was able to publish the whole Bible, having been greatly assisted in his task by the purse of Archbishop Whitgift and by the advice of many willing scholars, such as Dean Goodman of Westminster, and Bishops Hughes, Bellott and Vaughan. In 1620 Bishop Parry of St. Asaph produced the Authorized Version of the Welsh Bible, while in 1630 appeared the first Bible in quarto —'Beibl Bach,' or Little Bible, as it was commonly termed in Wales—published at the expense of two London Welshmen, Sir Thomas Middleton and Rowland Heylin, who fixed its price at 5*s.*, thereby rendering this volume the first copy of the Scriptures accessible to any but the wealthy. The first Bible actually printed within the Principality was that of Peter Williams, the Methodist preacher and commentator, whose celebrated work was issued at Carmarthen in 1770. The first diglott edition of the Scriptures, with English and Welsh in parallel columns, was issued between 1823–1827, during which time the Rev. Joseph Harris ('Gomer') and J. A. Williams produced the complete work in forty-five parts at 1*s.* apiece for distribution to 1,500 subscribers in the counties of Glamorgan and Monmouth alone: a circumstance which easily proves the intense anxiety of the Welsh working-classes to obtain ably edited copies of the Bible even at so high a price as 2*l.* 5*s.* During the past century numberless editions of Welsh or diglott Bibles have appeared, and not a few of these have been published in America, one of the features at the largely attended exhibition of Welsh Bibles held in 1904 at the Cardiff Public

Digitized by Google

Library being a case of Welsh Testaments printed in New York.

We warmly congratulate Mr. Ballinger on having compiled from so many sources an admirable account of the Bible in Wales, which, taken in conjunction with its companion Bibliography, makes of this book a standard work of reference for all who desire to study the social and moral development of Wales; for the story of the translation and distribution of the Welsh Scriptures occupies a very important place in Cambrian annals since the Reformation, and it is a story in which, as we pointed out in the article to which we referred above, the place of Welsh Churchmen is as honourable as it is frequently forgotten.

II.—Systematic Theology.

A Manual of Theology. By Joseph Agar Beet, D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1906.) 10*s.* 6*d.*

Most writers who have endeavoured to construct a purely Biblical theology have started with the assumption of the inspiration of the Bible; but Dr. Beet makes no such assumption. Jesus of Nazareth, to whom history points as the source of an unparalleled influence for good, left no written record; but within a few decades of His departure some nine or ten writers, whose works prove their intelligence and honesty, and whose independence corroborates their general agreement, wrote in narratives and in treatises what they knew and believed of Him. Without assuming their special inspiration, we are historically justified in taking their consentient witness as giving a true account of the Master and His doctrine; and the task which remains for the theologian is to collect and co-ordinate their statements. This Dr. Beet proceeds to do with admirable diligence and candour.

In all this we hail a return to the Catholic principle that the Person of our Incarnate Lord, and no book, however sacred, is the Revelation of God to men. But we doubt whether Dr. Beet really adheres to his purpose. Half at least of his book is based upon St. Paul's doctrine of Justification as expounded by Luther. We do not purpose to discuss this doctrine; but we cannot accept it as historically derived from the Master. The characteristic phrase, 'Justification through Faith,' is used by no one in the New Testament save St. Paul (p. 164); and the teaching of other New Testament writers, though it may be harmonized with his, is certainly not identical with it. In fact,

Digitized by Google

the doctrine in question bears such evident traces of the mind of the converted Pharisee and of the controversies in which he was engaged that we may be sure that it is not a record of the actual teaching of our Lord, but a disciple's inference from that teaching. St. Paul's analytic temper leads him to discriminate between the Faith that justifies and the Faith that sanctifies—between Salvation through faith and Salvation in obedience; and Lutheran scholasticism goes further in this direction, to treat different aspects of a thing as distinct things; but we believe the way of safety lies in subordinating such analysis to an earlier and wider synthesis, in which all grace is the bestowal of the Divine Life, and all faith is the reception of it. To this truth all the sacred writers in their different ways bear witness.

Dr. Beet hardly seems to give due weight to the fact that a whole generation of disciples lived before a word of the New Testament was written, and more than two generations before it was completed; and, again, that the experience of believers in all subsequent ages forms part of our knowledge of God. The unique value of the New Testament as *proving* a religion already possessed is not to be confused with use of it as a *basis* of a religion which is to be constructed; and Dr. Beet seems to us to use as a foundation-stone the spire which was meant to serve as a land-mark.

We have thought it well to confine our remarks to principles rather than details. We should be bound to differ from many statements as to the nature of the Church and the sacraments; and particularly from the denial to baptized infants of the privileges of children of God (p. 411): as if God's grace had to wait upon man's faith. We are surprised to find little or no notice of passages which speak of the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands; of the commission to the Church to forgive sins; of the nature and law of matrimony. Comparing this manual with some others, we miss in it the broad humanity and the literary grace of Dr. Mason's *Faith of the Gospel* and the philosophical insight of Dr. Strong; but we do not undervalue its diligence, its sober and devout tone, and its fidelity to the truths of the Divine Unity and Trinity and the Godhead of our Lord.

III.—Religious Education.

A Child's Life of Christ. By Mabel Dearmer. (London: Methuen and Co., 1906.) 6*s*.

We congratulate Mrs. Dearmer on the skill with which she has attempted a difficult, not to say an impossible, task. The

Digitized by Google

Evangelists themselves do not tell us the half of what we long to know, but they have set a standard which makes all subsequent Lives of Christ seem cold and disappointing. And yet each generation needs some one to write the Life of Christ in its own language and with reference to the accumulated experience of Christians, who must know more of what Christ has been to the world even than those who were eye-witnesses of His Incarnate life. To write the Life of Christ one must not only be very familiar with the holy Gospels: one must know how to bring together things new and old. Above all, the mothers of every generation must tell the old old story in a way that will reach their children's hearts, and stimulate curiosity without a word to lessen their reverence and love.

It is because Mrs. Dearmer has insight into the mind of a child as well as love and reverence for the Gospel of Christ that we cordially recommend this beautiful book, enriched as it is with Miss Brickdale's striking illustrations. The latter are unconventional and somewhat after the style of Tissot. We specially like the Nativity, and the solitary figure on the Cross labelled 'The King's Triumph.' We find the 'Empty Tomb' less suggestive and convincing than the well-known frontispiece to Dr. Latham's *Risen Master*; but the whole series are a distinct addition to the book.

Mrs. Dearmer has written down just what one would like to hear a mother say to her children with the living voice; assuming that they are intelligent children between the ages of five and ten, and therefore quite capable of receiving deep spiritual truth, it is clothed in simple language and presented in an orderly fashion.

In a careful reading of the whole we have noticed only two or three slips on points which we should have wished otherwise expressed. It seems a mistake to say of the miracle at Cana (p. 33), 'This was the first time that our Lord had used the power of the Spirit of God,' for we are sure that the author does not mean to imply that our Lord only used the power of the Holy Spirit for miraculous works. It is important to insist that all through His Incarnate life our Lord was dependent on the Holy Spirit, who acted on His humanity as He does on ours. On p. 71 it is a definite mistake to say that the first words of the Sermon on the Mount were 'Blessed are the humble.' Humility belongs to the third beatitude, and St. Matthew's first 'Blessed are the poor in spirit' must be related to St. Luke's 'Blessed are ye poor,' which is qualified and deepened by the addition of 'in spirit.' It is a great pity to miss the force of our

Digitized by Google

Lord's teaching about poverty and wealth by applying the term 'poor in spirit' to something else. That Mrs. Dearmer is not unfamiliar with the social doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount is apparent elsewhere; *e.g.* in a pointed application on p. 214 to those who make long prayers and yet live on the rents that they get from widows' houses.

It is a question how far it is wise to use a paraphrase, when children would be just as likely to understand the words of the Bible, and we have a decided preference for that reverence for the letter of Holy Scripture which attaches importance to accurate knowledge of the very words. Perhaps, however, there is a difference between the telling of the story *viva voce* and the reading from a book. A certain familiarity and use of childish language is quite tolerable in talking to a child, while the same jars a little when it is written down and so invites comparison with the Bible language.

But our readers must judge for themselves, and if any departure from familiar words is tolerable, one could scarcely find the story better told than in such a passage as this:

'Once again our Lord Jesus went up by Himself into a mountain. He had gone up into a mountain to preach the sermon that had set forth the New Law for the first time. Now He wanted all men to hear of that Law. How could this be brought about? Whenever our Lord Jesus had some great thing to accomplish, He always spent many hours in prayer. This time He prayed all night. You can think of Him alone on the mountain side, kneeling among the mountain flowers—the white daisies, the blue gentians, and the tall red lilies; you can think of Him kneeling under the quiet stars, praying to his Father for strength and guidance in the great work that lay before Him.

'All night he prayed. The sounds of the night were around him—the howl of the jackal, the hoot of the owl, and the humming of many insects. When at last the sun shewed above the mountain, touching it with light, our Lord rose from his knees. The day had come. His prayer of the night was over. He knew now what to do in order to set up the Kingdom of God upon the earth' (p. 81).

We are less satisfied with such a description as follows of the scene in the Home at Bethany, though it is certainly well calculated to interest a child and impress on his mind the characters of Martha and Mary, even if it may seem to older readers a little lacking in dignity. But on the whole the style of the book is admirable. The story of the Passion and the Resurrection is quite excellent, and we are sure that Mrs. Dearmer may count on the gratitude of both children and their teachers.

Digitized by Google

The Way to Teach the Bible, according to the method in use at the Church of Ireland Training College, Kildare Place, Dublin. By H. KINGSMILL MOORE, D.D. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1906.) 6s.

THIS little book is evidently the outcome of considerable experience, and the author applies to the teaching of the Bible methods which are comparatively new in England in secular subjects, and which, until quite recently, no one thought of applying to Holy Scripture. The reader will be disappointed if he expects to find fresh light on the subject matter of the Bible, or even the barest recognition of the difficulties scientific and literary which the growth of knowledge and modern criticism suggest. However, there is no lack of help to be found elsewhere by one who wishes to teach, not a new Theology but the old Theology with the fresh light that has been thrown upon it. Such a one will rather turn to Dr. Driver's *Genesis*, or the stores of Biblical learning to be found in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. But there is certainly room for a book on method, which will make the teacher realize the seriousness and importance of his calling, and the need of presenting truth in the way which is most likely to arrest the attention, and secure that the pupil shall assimilate what he is taught.

Dr. Kingsmill Moore does not claim originality for the method which has gradually been evolved in the Kildare Place Training College, and it is none the worse for being very like that employed in teaching secular subjects in the German secondary schools. It is hardly possible to do justice to a scientific treatise by extracts, but the following quotations will perhaps sufficiently indicate the scope of the book.

'The object of the Kildare Place method is to employ a system similar to the German in connexion with religious instruction and the subject of Holy Scripture (p. 45).

'In connexion with religion and the Bible, however, all is of permanent value, and a method is doubly precious which not only simplifies the immediate lesson, but also gives added power for dealing with the whole subject (p. 46).

'If our method is to yield its full fruits, it must be by means of a Leading Thought which will convey religious truth' (p. 47).

Subsequent chapters shew the teacher how to select his leading thoughts, and sub-thoughts, and this is illustrated by examples of right and wrong analyses.

We cannot say that we have found the book so suggestive

Digitized by Google

or helpful as we hoped, though we can well believe that it will be of real service to teachers who will take the trouble to master its method; but they must gain elsewhere their capacity for seeing spiritual truth and the zeal which will make them wish to impart it to others in the best possible way. The quotations from Dr. Thring, the great headmaster of Uppingham, are stimulating indeed, and we should like to see the book in the hands of those who are so foolish as to fancy that religious teaching is of such slight importance that we must not inquire whether teachers are qualified by personal conviction and adequate knowledge for a work which requires a clear head and a loving heart.

Simple Talks to Little Children on Holy Subjects. By LADY SNAGGE. (London: Skeffington and Co., 1906.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

THESE are just the sort of lessons for a mother to give to her quite little children on Sunday afternoons. They bring before them in very simple language the chief facts of the Christian Faith following in the main the course of the Christian year. We are sorry that a lesson has not been provided for every Sunday, for we think that the little book would then have had a more extended usefulness; and the treatment of some topics, which might be made interesting and intelligible to little children, is too slight. We have noticed very little that calls for correction, but the author seems to fall into a common mistake when she tells us, that the wise men found the Holy Child lying in a manger. St. Matthew tells us that they came into the house, not into the stable, and it seems natural to suppose that several days had elapsed and a change had taken place since the shepherds found Him in the manger. We do not agree with her derivation of Whitsun Day, and even assuming that she is right in deriving it from 'White,' the point about Holy Baptism might be much more clearly put. We do not find the same charm and power of description as in Mrs. Dearmer's *Child's Life of Christ*, but this book might well be taken as an introduction to the other, and is apparently meant for rather younger children. We wish that those whose idea of the religious instruction which Church people give their children is derived from controversial sources, could notice in such books as these, that the simplest Bible teaching implies that the teacher has in the background that conception of the Person and work of our Blessed Lord which is safeguarded by the Creed. We quite

Digitized by Google

agree that controversy is unsuitable for children, and we do not wish to emphasize the points which divide Christians from one another, but we hold that no one can teach the Bible to any purpose who has not made up his mind whether or no he is going to speak of Jesus as the Saviour of the world and the eternal Son of the Father.

IV.—History.

Cambridge Modern History. Vol. IV. *The Thirty Years' War.* (Cambridge University Press, 1906.) 16s. net.

In the volume before us the editors have attained a larger measure of success than in some of its predecessors, owing to the possibility of a more complete unity of treatment. A further advantage comes from the fact that two of the editors, the Master of Peterhouse and Dr. George Prothero, are specialists on the period with which it deals; and, happily, they have both contributed a considerable amount of matter. Dr. A. W. Ward's work is remarkably clear, accurate, and complete. He knows German history thoroughly and he has spared no pains to master, and to sift critically, the large mass of pamphlet literature from which so much of our knowledge of the Thirty Years' War is ultimately derived. If we may select any part for special praise, we may observe that we find the whole account of the Bohemian question, and the history of the unhappy 'Winter King,' full of vivid interest and expressed with sound historical judgement.

When we pass to the French chapters, also the work of one of the editors, Mr. Stanley Leathes, we may repeat our praise. It is difficult to say anything new about Richelieu or Mazarin, but what is well known is here very well summarized. There is, for example, an excellent statement in brief of Richelieu's ecclesiastical policy. A fuller treatment of Jansenism, however, is desirable, but that may perhaps be looked for in a later volume; though a chapter by M. Émile Boutroux, Professor in the University of Paris, treats of Descartes and Pascal with considerable skill in twenty pages which make us wish for more.

The history of the countries which lie outside the general track of European politics has been entrusted to several thoroughly competent hands. In particular, Mr. George Edmundson's section dealing with Holland is a valuable addition to our standard historical work. On the other hand, we are obliged to confess to a certain dissatisfaction as to the proportion of

Digitized by Google

the volume regarded as a whole. The year 1659–60 in England was hardly important enough to have as much space as is allowed to more than half a century of the Papacy; and we really cannot see why Spanish literature should be disposed of in a couple of pages, while a particular school of English poetry, which had practically no influence on Europe generally, should have a whole chapter to itself. We confess, too, that we should have liked more about Italian history, and something about Italian literature. These faults, however, are perhaps inseparable from the general scheme—a scheme which we confess we have never fully understood. The editors have taken great pains to secure capable writers, to revise carefully all that is written, and to supply their readers with very full bibliographies. We have spoken before of defects: we prefer now rather to dwell upon merits, which are equally unquestionable. It is no small praise that in a work of this kind in many volumes, divided into a large number of sections allotted to different writers of different nationalities, different training and different degrees of ability, the editors have succeeded in obtaining a high standard of impartiality, as well as a high standard of accuracy. With whatever limitations, as a summary of European history the *Cambridge Modern History* will hold its own at least for our generation.

Parish Life in Mediaeval England. By ABBOT GASQUET. (London: Methuen, 1906.) *7s. 6d.*

THIS is the second of two delightful volumes in the series called 'The Antiquary's Books,' in which Abbot Gasquet has described the religious life of mediæval England. In the earlier, which dealt with life in monasteries, as well as in the present book, everything is as charming, everything works as prosperously as in the prospectus with which a company promoter attracts our subscriptions. It is all so smooth that it excites suspicion, and so much time has elapsed since the transactions with which the Abbot deals that a few annual reports with the accompanying balance-sheets would have been more relevant than the amiable generalities which he supplies. There is not a word untrue, but not a hint is given that anything is being withheld; and readers who are new to the subject will be in danger of thinking that the whole truth has been told them. If they are tempted, as they should be, by the apt quotations from Chaucer's Parish Priest to make the acquaintance of the other clerical characters

Digitized by Google

in the Canterbury Pilgrimage, they will resent the reticence with which the Abbot has concealed from them some of the most prominent features of mediaeval parish life. But if they are content with an *ex parte* statement, they can desire nothing better than they will find here. It is true that the learned writer does not always realize the ignorance of those whom he instructs, and that sometimes more explanation is necessary than he gives; sometimes again his statements are not full enough to be clear and to avoid apparent inconsistencies. He says, for instance, that Lyndwood gives infancy as the English age for Confirmation; but his picture of the rite shews lusty youths as the recipients. A little space could have been well spent in reconciling the apparent discrepancy. And while an account is given of the other sacraments of mediæval England, Extreme Unction receives no description at all.

The architectural part, the most difficult, is also the weakest, though it is very instructive and for the most part clear. But the 'altar-beam' is surely not so obscure a subject as it is here represented. Was it not the normal substitute in small churches for the rood-screen? Often enough, as at West Harnham, near Salisbury, the corbels which supported it can be seen in the east wall just above the altar, and it doubtless carried the Rood with the Virgin and St. John who in a larger building would have stood over the screen. Perhaps the most important section of the book is that which deals with the clergy and their pay. That part which deals with chantry-priests is admirable, and a real addition to popular knowledge, but we cannot say as much of the account of rectors and vicars. The responsibility for the repairs of the chancel is not stated with such precision as was possible; and too much is made of the theoretical share of the poor in a proportion of the tithe, while nothing is said on the interesting subject of glebe-land and of incumbents as farmers. Nor is the elaborate system by which pluralities were sanctioned and even monks under the vow of poverty were enabled to hold a benefice as papal chaplains even mentioned; nor the frequency of exchanges in the later middle ages, though this is one of the points in which change has been most striking. The history of appropriations is inadequately and misleadingly treated. No reader could understand from Abbot Gasquet's words how severe was the struggle by which the bishops forced reluctant monasteries to assign a fixed proportion of the income of their rectories to perpetual vicars, who should discharge all the duties in return for a small

Digitized by Google

share of the revenue; and when he lays stress upon the fact that this was done with the bishops' consent he allows us to imagine that they welcomed the transaction, when in fact they were but making the best of a bad job. And he does not follow the lead of Dr. Jessopp in telling us how appropriation often lowered the social status of the parochial clergy, rectors of the patron's family being succeeded by vicars of humbler antecedents. In fact, though there are singularly few errors and ample evidence of research, this is a book which cannot be accepted as an impartial guide, but it will be of the greatest assistance to any student who will correct its one-sided presentation of the evidence by means of authorities which the author himself has pointed out.

V.—Biography and General Literature.

The Life and Experiences of Sir Henry Enfield Roscoe, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S. Written by himself. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1906.) 12*s.* net.

In a short Preface the author explains that the publication of this book of about 400 pages is due to the wish of several of his friends that the memoirs which he had collected for his family only should be given a much wider circulation. Those who read this book and who take an interest in the history of scientific discovery, in the development of scientific and technical education, and perhaps in politics, will feel that the friends of Sir Henry Roscoe were justified in their persuasions, and will be glad that they were successful.

The chapters which are devoted to an account of his education as a chemist and to his work in the University of Heidelberg are full of interest. They give to younger generations of chemists an insight into the character and work of the Masters with whom the author was so closely associated, which must appeal strongly to all who think with gratitude of the labours of the men who made many of the generalizations, and laid the foundations of a number of the processes and practices which have become the necessities of modern scientific life. Reading the accounts of the early work which led to discoveries so far reaching as, for example, the coincidence of the bright lines of the spectra of metals with the Fraunhofer lines of the solar spectrum, it is easy to understand the admiration which Roscoe felt for his great teachers and the enthusiasm with which he pursued the work that was opened out before him. In the pages of the book before us there is evidence that Sir Henry

Digitized by Google

Roscoe has maintained that enthusiasm throughout his long connexion with science, and that it was one of the chief factors in attracting to his laboratories in Owens College men who learnt from him to devote their best energies to the subject of which he was so inspiring a teacher.

There is much to attract serious attention in the chapters on his work in Manchester and on his connexion with the early movements for technical education. The leading part which Roscoe played in the creation of the Victoria University and in the fostering of scientific education within its walls is a matter of history. The effect of his marked ability and organizing powers on the development of technical education may be read into rather than in his accounts of its growth and progress.

The later chapters deal with his political life, with his work on the Pasteur Commission, and with his relation to the University of London, and the book ends with a short description of his home life, which Sir Henry Roscoe's readers may well hope will continue to bring him the happiness due to him after so useful and distinguished a career.

Frederick York Powell. By OLIVER ELTON. Vol. I. Memoir and Letters; Vol. II. Writings. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.) 21s. net.

THERE is much in the volumes of 'memoriae' of the late Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford which should deeply interest Churchmen. He was a man much admired, and indeed beloved, in a very wide circle, not only among men of learning but among artists in letters and painting, among those who are but loosely attached to the ordinary conventions of modern English society, and among political agents of types the most 'advanced' and strange. But at the same time he was heartily admired by many leading ecclesiastics, and he returned the admiration. In the memoirs of this utterly unclerical, even anti-clerical, man there is a charming passage in eulogy of certain bishops and another in praise of Liddon. He wrote more fairly and with more sympathy and understanding of the English Church than any other man ever wrote who disbelieved the Christian faith. The biography which Professor Elton has written, very largely from letters, with really extraordinary skill, is one which all thoughtful people should read. It describes a type which is far from uncommon to-day—the man who without a bitter or ungenerous thought passes religion wholly

Digitized by Google

by, as regards his own life, who clearly regards the Church's teaching as a fable, yet does not go out to the attack, or seek helpers in his unbelief, or vary in the least in his generous kindness to believers. Powell was a very exceptional man; he had a wonderfully wide knowledge of every subject in which man in all the centuries has been interested—there was no subject in which a specialist in it would not find him well informed—a statement which could, perhaps, in his generation be true of no other man; not one of those whose ultimate opinions he shared was to be compared to him in width of outlook; and yet, on analysis, his religious position can only be explained—if that be any explanation—on some theory of an 'anima naturaliter pagana'; he was constantly reminding those who knew him, among a host of other strange affinities, of Pater's Denys l'Auxerrois. He seemed to belong to another age than our own; and yet not one other age, but many; and all the time he was full to the brim of ideas, the most modern of all. The man who was the friend of Liddon, and Creighton, and Paget was also the friend of Verlaine, and R. A. M. Stevenson, and Stepniak, and W. B. Yeats, and yet again W. P. Ker, and Vigfusson, and Freeman, and many pure historians, pure scholars, and plain folk in every class of life. It was characteristic of him that he placed together in a dedication a great Dean of Christ Church and a humble fisherman, equally characteristic that he could talk wisely of the most delicate art with an artist and of the most revolutionary schemes with an anarchic chimney-sweep. The man is in truth profoundly interesting. His hasty judgements, as we see them in his letters, are interesting; so are his reviews (scraps of them are now collected in vol. ii.), most of which were probably at least as interesting; so were his profoundly serious judgements in history, his survey of the reign of Queen Victoria, his vigorous denunciation of Calvin, his unfeigned regret at the Reformation (which, he once wrote, 'ruined art and divided society'), his critical weighing of Mahomet, or Madame de Krudener, or Napoleon, or Sir Walter Raleigh; so were his acute yet generous estimates of contemporary historians, such as Freeman (whom he ranked high, but not too high), Froude (whom he ranked low, yet not too low), Gardiner, and Creighton. His own achievements, in any permanent form, were slight; probably the greatest of them, which belonged to the literature and history of Teutonic heathendom, were almost entirely due to his great inspirer, the Icelandic Vigfusson. But he most deeply influenced, at a critical point in their career, many young men, and set them on

Digitized by Google

the right track as students—serious, conscientious, systematic (which he never was), unselfish, and generous (which he always was). He certainly, with all his pagan spirit, leaves behind him the sense of his having been a great helper, and there could be no part in life more Christian than that. He had hosts of friends, and every one of them, we may be sure, was the better for his friendship. It is such a memorial that reaches us in these volumes, a cairn on which scores of hands have placed each his stone. The words of the Dean of Christ Church say as well as it can be said why his *Life* is one to be seriously read.

'We knew him as a true and loyal friend, enlivening all intercourse with brilliant talk illustrated from his stores of learning and wide experience of human life; we knew him to be generous up to and even beyond the limit of prudence, profoundly sympathetic with oppressed people, stirred to his depths by the tragedy and pain of life; we knew him to be sincere, consistent, incapable of weak and unreal compromise—and this especially in those matters where he differed profoundly from the usual beliefs of men. What was the full history of his attitude on these questions, no man knows, nor can we presume to sit in judgement upon it. If he stood outside the kingdom in this life, he was surely one who was not far from its gates. God will know all about it, and may God grant him light!'

Ronsard and La Pléiade. With Selections from their Poetry and some Translations in the Original Metres. By GEORGE WYNDHAM. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1906.) 5*s.* net.

To bring home the beauties of French Renaissance poetry to those unable to appreciate the sixteenth-century French in which it is written is apparently the laudable ambition of the author of this volume. This we may conclude from the prose translations of the introduction, which gives, in sixty pages, a brightly-written survey of the literary period, with such slight bibliographical indications, that the lay reader will, with a few exceptions, hardly know whether to ascribe all or none of the results arrived at to the author. Such details may be left to the 'wooden compilers of literary manuals,' to whom the author pays the solitary compliment of going out of his way to give them some hard knocks.

The introduction would lead one to suspect an acquaintance with metrical theory far behind that practical mastery of metres which is displayed in the final section of the book. On page 33 we read: 'What, then, did the Pléiade effect? They settled decisively . . . that rhyme is at once a necessity for lyrics in modern languages which have no definite quantities,

Digitized by Google

and a treasure added to the economy of classic verse; that modern poetry, based on the number, and not on the time-value, of syllables in a line, must be contrived in consonance with the ancient songs and genius of European languages. . . . ' If we really could argue the question of 'modern poetry' and 'European languages' in these simple and comprehensive terms, it would save a great deal of the trouble caused by the eternal warring in English of the principles of stress and syllabism.

The real interest of the book lies in the translations. Here the author certainly achieves a large measure of success in the essential task of the poetical translator, in that, namely, of bringing home to us, by the production of poetry in our mother tongue, the poetical worth of his original, in place of leaving us, as so many do, with only hearsay evidence on the point.

In these fifty pages of translations Mr. Wyndham has added something to English literature. One of his best renderings is that of Belleau's April, while a number of the sonnets are particularly good.

Captain John Smith. By A. C. BRADLEY. English Men of Action Series. (London: Macmillan and Co.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE romantic legend of Captain Smith and the beautiful Princess Pocahontas is familiar by name to most of our readers, but it may be supposed that but few have any clear idea of Captain Smith or of the real work he did towards the formation of the first English Colony on the mainland of the American Continent.

His extraordinary adventures as a soldier of fortune in various European wars are here briefly and carefully set down, adventures which would read like fiction if they were not substantiated by contemporary documents. His trials and difficulties, when he devoted his powers to the service of his own country and in the new settlement of Jamestown in Virginia, are almost incredible. Three hundred years ago the first little company reached the new land on the Virginian coast, sent out by the London Virginian Company, acting under Royal Charter. As a return for the royal favour, the first settlement was named after the King, and the two capes which bound Chesapeake Bay received the names Henry and Charles after the two Princes.

Earlier private attempts to establish colonies on the Eastern coast of North America had failed, but from the landing of the party under the Royal Charter of 1606 there has been a permanent English settlement there. The foolish administration, the absurd

Digitized by Google

rules laid down in London for the guidance of the infant colony, the rivalries among the settlers are all vividly portrayed in this little book, which, without any endeavour to belaud the man who is the central figure of the story, sufficiently shews how exceedingly able and far-seeing he was, and how different would have been the fortunes of the colony if he had been given the care of it from the first.

The famous story of his relations with the Indian Princess has now been stripped of the veneer of improbable details with which its truth had been obscured by the lovers of romance, and it is of great interest and very curious. He died a disappointed and neglected man, but had lived to see flourishing colonies along that New England coast which he had discovered and named, colonies based on the principles he had for years laid down as essential to real prosperity and which have borne abundant fruit.

This work is of special interest at the celebration of the third centenary of the foundation of the first English Church on the American continent at Jamestown in Virginia.

Periodicals.

Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. VIII. No. 30. January 1907. Frowde). Bishop of Ely: 'The Lord's Command to Baptize' (Matt. xxviii. 19). G. St. Clair: 'Israel in Camp: a Study.' "Astro-theology." Genesis and Exodus in relation to the Zodiac. H. Pope, O.P.: 'III Esdras and the Tridentine Canon.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'Codex Taurinensis (Y),' VII. Sophonias. E. O. Winstedt: 'A Coptic Fragment attributed to James the Brother of the Lord.' MS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. Copt. 129. Dom R. H. Connolly: 'The Original Language of the Syriac Acts of John.' Syriac. H. St. J. Thackeray: 'The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings.' E. Bishop: 'Spanish Symptoms.' Influence of the Visigothic Church on those of England and Ireland. W. Emery Barnes: 'Not a Gloss (II Kings xv. 30 b).' A. Souter: 'A Tenth-Century Fragment of Tertullian's *Apology*.' MS. xcv. in the Kantons-Bibliothek, Zürich. R. H. Malden: '*Quicunque uult saluus esse*.' Dom E. C. Butler: 'Funk *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*.' A. Souter: 'Holder *Die Reichenauer Handschriften*, I.' J. Hunter Smith: 'E. A. Abbott *Silanus the Christian*.'

The Expositor (N. S. Nos. 13–15. January–March 1907. Hodder & Stoughton). H. A. Redpath: 'Christ, the Fulfilment of Prophecy.' W. L. Walker: 'Christ's Preaching of the Kingdom.' C. Anderson Scott: 'Dr. Swete's Edition of the Apocalypse.' J. H. A. Hart: 'Scribes of the Nazarenes. II. The Gospel according to Luke and the Descent into Hades' (March. III. The Reed and the Courtier). Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'Pisidian Antioch' (*continued* March). J. Moffatt: 'Notes on recent N. T. Study.' February. Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'Professor Harnack

Digitized by Google

on Luke.' J. Stalker: 'Robert Rainy.' J. Rendel Harris: 'Sons of Thunder.' W. H. Bennett: 'The Life of Christ according to St. Mark' (*continued*). A. E. Garvie: 'The Agony in the Garden.' G. C. Martin: 'The Epistle of James as a Storehouse of the Sayings of Jesus.' A. R. Gordon: 'Job' (*continued* March). March. Dean Bernard: 'The *Magnificat*.' B. W. Bacon: 'Lucan *v.* Johannine Chronology.' T. Barns: 'The Number of the Beast: a warning against Mithras Worship.' J. Rendel Harris: 'Irenaeus on the Apostolical Preaching.'

The Hibbert Journal (Vol. V. No. 2. January 1907. Williams & Norgate). A. Campbell Fraser: 'Our Final Venture.' A. O. Lovejoy: 'The Entangling Alliance of Religion and History.' P. Sabatier: 'La Crise religieuse en France et en Italie.' G. G. Coulton: 'The Failure of the Friars.' R. S. Conway: 'The Messianic Idea in Vergil.' R. J. Campbell: 'The Christian Doctrine of Atonement as influenced by Semitic Religious Ideas.' H. Rashdall: 'A Grave Peril to the Liberty of Churchmen: the Ecclesiastical Discipline Report.' C. S. Patton: 'The New Theism.' F. F. Grensted: 'The Eternal "Now" in Anglican Theology: a Point of Contact between the New Theism and the Old.' H. MacColl: 'Chance or Purpose?' B. de Sélincourt: 'The Parallelism of Religion and Art: a Comment on William Blake.' W. R. Boyce Gibson: 'A. Peace Policy for Idealists.' Discussions. L. Campbell: 'T. Gomperz *Greek Thinkers*.' Lengthy. W. Harris: 'W. S. Palmer *An Agnostic's Progress*' and '*A Modern Pilgrim's Progress*.' T. K. Cheyne: 'Briggs *Psalms*, I.' (*Int. Crit. Comm.*). J. Drummond: 'J. H. Moulton *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, I.' and 'E. A. Abbott *Johannine Grammar*.' F. W. O. Ward: 'W. J. Williams *Newman, Pascal, Loisy and the Catholic Church*.' C. B. Welland 'Ovenden *Problems in Life and Religion*.' J. Moffatt: 'Schmid *The Scientific Creed of a Theologian*.'

The American Journal of Theology (Vol. XI. No. 1. January 1907. Chicago University Press). H. C. Mabie, P. Carus, F. A. Christie: 'Has Christianity the Moral Right to Supplant the Ethnic Faiths?' F. Giesebrecht: 'The Moral Level of the O. T. Scriptures.' A. A. Forrest: 'The Cry "Back to Christ": its Implication.' F. C. Porter: 'The Sufficiency of the Religion of Jesus.' B. B. Warfield: 'Africa and the Beginnings of Christian Latin Literature.' W. Rauschenbusch: 'The Influence of Historical Studies on Theology.' H. W. Wright: 'An Immutable Absolute or a God who Strives?' C. R. Gregory: 'Critical Note: 1 John v. 7, 8.' Reviews. 'Driver *Job*.' 'Cobb *Psalms*.' 'Duhm *Das Buch Habakuk*.' H. A. A. Kennedy: 'The Life of Jesus in the Light of Recent Discussions.' J. H. Moulton: 'Abbott *Johannine Grammar*.' Lengthy. F. H. Foster: 'H. C. Sheldon *System of Christian Doctrine*.' F. H. Geselbracht: 'The Character of Modern Preaching in Germany.' W. T. Paullin: 'Arnal *La Personne du Christ et le Rationalisme allemand contemporain*, I.'

The Princeton Theological Review (Vol. V. No. 1. January 1907. Princeton University Press). W. P. Armstrong: 'The Resurrection and the Origin of the Church in Jerusalem.' J. B. Kelso: 'Mediaeval Mariolatry.' J. P. Hoskins: 'German Influence on Religious Life and Thought in America during the Colonial Period.' C. E. Erdman: 'Modern Practical Theology.' A. Brummelkamp: 'Revision of Article XXXVI

Digitized by Google

of the Confessio Belgica.' J. De Witt: 'Relations of Church History to Preaching.' Reviews. B. B. Warfield: 'W. H. Fitchett *The Unrealized Logic of Religion*'; 'Biesterveld *De Jongste Methode voor de Verklaring van het N. T.*;' 'E. v. Dobschütz *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*' (E. T.); 'Grützmacher *Hieronymus*;' 'Charteris *The Church of Christ.*' K. D. Macmillan: 'Ungnad *Babylonisch-Assyrische Grammatik.*' W. P. Armstrong: 'D. Smith *The Days of His Flesh.*' L. B. Crane: 'Ramsay *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia.*' P. P. Flournoy: 'Sanday *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.*' C. Martin: 'R. J. Campbell *The Song of Ages: Sermons.*' Alas! Alas! F. W. Loetscher: 'Nitobé *Bushido, the Soul of Japan.*'

The Dublin Review (Vol. CXL. No. 280. January 1907. Burns & Oates). 'Lord Acton and the "Rambler."' 'Church and State in Spain.' Dom Chapman: 'The Condemnation of Pope Honorius.' W. Barry: 'The Liturgy of Toledo.' Reviews 'Férotin *Le Liber Ordinum.*' 'W. H. Kent: The Gaelic Revival.' 'Robert, Earl of Lytton, Statesman and Poet.' Mgr. W. F. Brown: 'The Education Bill of 1906.' Lord Hugh Cecil: 'Lord Rosebery's "Randolph Churchill."' R. Balfour: 'René Bazin's Apology for French Catholics.' F. Y. Eccles: 'The Fame and Failure of Ronsard.' Reviews 'G. Wyndham *Ronsard and la Pléiade.*' Notices. 'W. J. Williams *Newman, Pascal, Loisy.*' 'Abbott *Silanus the Christian.*' 'P. S. Allen *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi.*' 'H. M. Vaughan *The Last of the Royal Stuarts.*' 'Briggs and von Hügel *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch.*'

The Interpreter (Vol. III. No. 2. January 1907. Simpkin, Marshall). F. R. Tennant: 'Points of Contact between Theology and Science of the Present Day, II.' F. J. F. Jackson: 'Israel and Babylon, II.' A. H. McNeile: 'Israel in the Time of the Judges.' G. Tandy: 'Elementary Studies in Biblical Criticism, II. The Question of Authorship.' H. Johnson: 'The Spirit of the Early European Missionaries: a Study in St. Luke's Gospel.' F. W. O. Ward: 'The Parable of the Parousia.' H. D. A. Major: 'The Treatment of Dogma in our Teaching and Preaching.' Reviews. 'Abbott *Silanus the Christian.*' 'Swete *Apocalypse.*'

The Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. XIX. No. 74. January 1907. Macmillan.) G. E. Biddle: 'A Theist's Impressions of Judaism.' I. Elbogen: 'Studies in the Jewish Liturgy.' A. Cowley: 'Bodleian Geniza Fragments, IV.' MS. Bodl. Heb. a. 3. L. Ginzberg: 'Geonic Responsa' (*continued*). J. H. A. Hart: 'The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus.' H. S. Q. Henriques: 'The Political Rights of English Jews.' S. A. Cook: 'Notes on O. T. History' (*continued*). S. Fyne: 'Psalm cxxxiii.' A. F. Steuart: 'Jews in Rome, 1704.' S. Poznański: 'Zu dem sendschreiben des Nehemia Gaon.' Reviews. I. Elbogen: 'G. Margoliouth *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum*, II.' Lengthy. L. Blau: 'The Extraordinary Points in the Pentateuch.' N. Bentwich: 'Husik *Judah Messer Leon's Commentary on the "Vetus Logica."*' A. Wolf: 'Hirschfeld *Judah Halevi's Kitab al Khazari*;' 'Bäck *Das Wesen des Judentums.*' I. A[brahams]: 'Bibliography of Hebraica and Judaica, Oct.-Dec. 1906.'

The Expository Times (Vol. XVIII. Nos. 4–6. January–March 1907. T. and T. Clark). J. MacConnachie: 'The Liberal Movement in Germany'

Digitized by Google

(*continued* Feb.–March). F. Hommel: 'The Ark of Jahweh.' V. McNabb: 'The Christ of the Fourth Gospel.' 'The Fourth Gospel.' 'Skeat and Blagden *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula.*' J. Denney: 'Gennrich *Die Lehre von der Wiedergeburt.*' C. B. Upton: 'A. Monod *Aux Croyants et aux Athées.*' W. M. Ramsay: 'New Evidence on the Date of Polycarp's Martyrdom.' P. W. Schmiedel: 'The Article *Gospels* and the Preface to Neumann's *Jesus.*' February. R. B. Taylor: 'J. A. Selbie.' A. Deissmann: 'The New Testament in the Light of recently discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World' (*continued*). R. Mackintosh: 'Prof. Gwatkin on Revelation.' A. H. Sayce: 'The Archaeological Analysis of the Book of Genesis.' J. Hunter Smith: 'Decease' ('Exodos'). E. Nestle: 'In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.' Not due to St. Augustine but to Peter Meiderlin of Augsburg (Saec, XVII). A. L. Williams: 'A Modern Jonah.' Disposes of the story in Hastings' *Dict. Bible*, ii. 750. W. J. Moulton: 'Duhm *Das Buch Habahuk.*' March. W. Sanday: 'Prof. Burkitt on the Gospel History.' A. Souter: 'A suggested Relationship between Titus and Luke.' II Cor. xii. 18, viii. 18. W. H. Daubney: 'The Song of the Three.' J. Iverach: 'O Holtzmann, *Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaft.*' J. S. Banks: 'Recent Discoveries.' The new work by Irenaeus published in *Texte und Untersuchungen.*

The Review and Expositor (Vol. IV. No. 1. January 1907. Louisville, Ky.) P. Carnegie Simpson: 'The Problem of Pain.' J. Iverach: 'Attempts to eliminate the Supernatural from the Gospel History.' W. T. Whitley: 'The Epistle to the Hebrews, x. 19 to end.' W. Ashmore: 'The Kingship of Jehovah.' D. Walker: 'The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians.' S. C. Mitchell: 'The Preacher for the Present South.' J. Ten Broeke: 'The Theoretical Value of Moral and Religious Experience.' Reviews. J. R. Sampey: 'Orr *The Problem of the Old Testament.*' (12 pages). E. C. Dargan: 'Brastow *The Modern Pulpit.*' W. J. McGlothlin: 'J. C. H. Williams *Life of Sir George Williams, Founder of the Y. M. C. A.*' 'Harnack *Militia Christi.*' B. H. de Ment: 'Agar Beet *Manual of Theology.*' W. O. Carver: 'Ballard *Haechel's Monism False.*' Haeckel is very little read in America. A T. Robertson: 'Harnack *Lukas der Arzt*; 'Blass *Die Rhythmen der Asianischen u. Römischen Kunstprosa*'; 'Swete *Apocalypse.*'

The Independent Review (Vol. XII. Nos. 40–42. January–March 1907. John Lane). E. Dimnet: 'The Crisis in France.' H. Paul: 'The Victorian Drawing-Room: Lady Dorothy Nevill's *Memoirs.*' J. A. Hill: 'The Fallacies of Materialism.' D. MacCarthy: 'Belloc *Hills and the Sea*' and 'W. H. Hudson *The Crystal Age.*' February. E. O. Fordhâm and R. M. Ferguson: 'The Small Holdings Committee.' H. H. Henson: 'The National Church and the Education Bill—a Retrospect.' C. H. Roberts: 'Some Words on Local Veto.' Hon. B. Russell: 'The Development of Morals.' H. Rashdall: 'A Mediaeval Herodotus.' Salimbene. M. Strachey: 'Wyndham *Ronsard and La Pléiade.*' J. W. Headlam: 'The Hohenlohe Memoirs.' D. MacCarthy: 'Tourguénief.' March. A. Galton: 'The New Theology of the City Temple.' L. T. Hobhouse: 'Sociology and Ethics.' G. L. Strachey: 'The First Earl of Lytton.' G. M. Trevelyan: 'A Puritan Henry George.' Gerrard Winstanley.

Digitized by Google

J. L. Hammond: 'O. M. Edwards *A Short History of Wales*.' D. MacCarthy: 'Three Books on Russian Literature.'

The Quarterly Review (No. 410. January 1907. Murray). R. E. Prothero: 'The Growth of the Historical Novel.' 'The Charity Organisation Society.' C. H. Herford: 'Ruskin and the Gothic Revival.' W. Miller: 'The Dukes of Athens.' G. Saintsbury: 'Balzac and M. Brunetière.' 'British Sea Fisheries.' 'Recent Developments of Old Testament Criticism.' I. Taylor: 'The Hôtel de Rambouillet.' G. S. Street: 'Lord Randolph Churchill.' 'The Memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe.' 'The Ecclesiastical Crisis in France.'

The Classical Review (Vol. XXI. Nos. 1–2. February–March 1907. Nutt). J. P. Postgate: 'Rutilius, the last of the Pagans.' R. E. Macnaghten: 'The Character and Language of the Athenians.' 'Excavations at Manchester.' March. W. H. S. Jones: 'Quintilian, Plutarch and the Early Humanists.' J. H. Moulton: 'Frazer *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*.' G. Macdonald: 'Head *Coins of Phrygia*.'

The Contemporary Review (Nos. 493–5. January–March 1907. Horace Marshall). P. J. Maclagan: 'Christian Missions and the Civil Power in China.' L. M. Phillipps: 'Santa Sophia.' E. Martinengo Cesaresco: 'The Growth of Modern Ideas on Animals.' R. Heath: 'Peasant Insurrections, 1381 and 1525.' Criticizes 'Oman *The Great Revolt of* 1381.' A. P. Nicholson: 'Manet and Monet.' T. J. Macnamara: 'The Education Bill and After.' 'J. Oman *The Problem of Faith*.' '*Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*.' 'H. E. P. Platt *Last Rambles in the Classics*.' February. E. M. Caillard: 'A Psychological Puzzle.' A most curious study in Personality. J. F. Wilkinson: 'Government and Discipline in the Church of England.' J. Mew: 'Yiddish Literature and Drama.' 'R. Finot *Race Prejudice*.' 'Dennett *At the Bach of the Black Man's Mind*.' 'Cairns *Christianity in the Modern World*.' 'Montmorency *Thomas à Kempis*.' March. E. Sellers: 'The State Children of Hungary.' Goldwin Smith: 'Canada, England and the States.' T. H. Weir: 'Higher Criticism and the Koran.' C. D. Burns: 'The Use of Names in the Gospel of St. Mark.' 'Carroll *Prisoners of Hope—an Exposition of Dante's "Purgatorio."*' 'Driver *Jeremiah*.' 'C. F. Kent *Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament*.'

The Catholic World (Vol. LXXXIV. Nos. 502–4. January–March 1907. New York.) G. M. Searle: 'The Recent Results of Psychical Research' (*continued* March). J. J. Keane: 'The Catholic Hierarchy.' L. E. Lapham: 'Fogazzaro and his Trilogy.' R. H. Benson: 'The State of Religion in England.' J. J. Fox: 'The Relations of Church and State' (*continued* March). Reviews. 'Alston *Stoic and Christian in the Second Century*.' 'McTaggart *Some Dogmas of Religion*.' February. M. D. Petre: 'The Fallacy of Undenominationalism.' A. Lloyd: 'A School of the Prophets for Japan.' Reviews. 'Bréhier *L'Eglise et l'Orient au Moyen Age: Les Croisades*.' 'Briggs and Von Hügel *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch*.' March. F. Aveling: 'Mr. Campbell's New Theology.' K. Brégy: 'The Poetry of Aubrey de Vere.' M. M. Maxwell Scott: 'The Nuns of the Visitation at Rouen, 1792–1807.' Reviews. 'Giraud *Questions d'Histoire et d'Archéologie Chrétienne*.' 'H. Paul *History of Modern England*.'

Digitized by Google

The Monthly Review (Nos. 76–8. January-March 1907. Murray). W. H. Mallock: 'The Intellectual Condition of the Labour Party, III.' E. E. Williams: 'Temperance and the Statute Book.' G. S. Street: 'Ghosts of Piccadilly—81 and 82.' (February 'Albany,' March 'Byron.') C. de la Warr: 'Jane, Duchess of Gordon.' A. E. Keeton: 'Johannes Brahms, 1833–1897.' A. Cecil: 'J. A. Froude.' L. Jerrold: 'France and the Pope's Move.' February. R. Grant: 'A Boer Poet.' W. du Plessis. E. A. Pratt: 'Humanity and Stimulants.' A. Symons: 'Dante and Botticelli—a Renaissance Study.' J. Vaughan: 'George Crabbe as a Botanist.' A. R. Colquhoun: 'The Secret of Japanese Patriotism.' J. A. Hill: 'Spiritualism.' S. L. Bastin: 'The British *v.* the American Horticulturists.' March. G. W. Prothero: 'Frederick York Powell.' G. Biagi: 'The Mind and Manners of a Florentine Merchant of the Fourteenth Century.' 'Sir O. Lodge *The Substance of Faith allied with Science.*'

The Edinburgh Review (No. 419. January 1907. Longmans). 'The Age of Reason.' 'The Old and the New Alchemy.' 'Egypt: the Old Problem and the New.' 'Catholic Authority and Modern Society.' 'Tradition in Art.' 'The English Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century.' 'The Italian Garden.' 'Insular Fiction.' 'The State of Russia.'

The English Historical Review (Vol. XXII. No. 85. January 1907. Longmans). E. J. Webb: 'The Alleged Phoenician Circumnavigation of Africa.' F. M. Powicke: 'The Angevin Administration of Normandy, II.' L. F. Brown: 'The Religious Factors in the Convention Parliament.' 'Mary Bateson.' H. W. C. Davis: 'An Unpublished Life of Edmund Rich.' Balliol College MS. 226, Lambeth Library MS. 135, Cambridge University Library M.M. 4. 6 (Saec. XIII.). C. L. Falkiner: 'William Farmer's Chronicles of Ireland.' G. F. Warner: 'An Unpublished Political Paper by Daniel De Foe.' MS. Brit. Mus. Lansdowne 98. Reviews. H. J. White: 'Brochet *S. Jérôme et ses Ennemis.*' A. Souter: 'Rand *Johannes Scottus.*' C. V. Langlois: 'H. W. C. Davis *History of England,* 1066–1272' and 'Tout *Hist. Eng.* 1216–1377.' J. Tait: 'Oman *The Great Revolt of* 1381.' P. F. Willert: 'Lord Acton *Lectures on Modern History.*' E. M. Leonard: 'B. K. Gray *History of English Philanthropy.*' G. McN. Rushforth: 'Overton and Relton *The English Church from George I to End of Eighteenth Century.*' Sir S. Walpole: 'Brodrick and Fotheringham *History of England,* 1801–1837.' 'Head *Greek Coins of Phrygia.*' 'Mollat *Lettres communes de Jean XXII.*' 'Vogt *Erzbischof Mathias von Mainz,* 1321–8.' 'Waltz *Fr. Bartolomé de Las Casas.*' 'Vaughan *The Last of the Royal Stuarts.*' 'Whitaker *History and Criticism of the Labour Theory of Value.*' 'Elton *F. York Powell.*' 'Humphreys *Somersetshire Parishes.*' 'Roper *Materials for the History of the Church of Lancaster,* III, IV.'

The Economic Review (Vol. XVII. No. 1. January 1907. Rivingtons). W. Temple: 'Christian Education in Elementary Schools.' J. A. Dale: 'Bournville.' G. Crosse: 'The Poplar Workhouse Inquiry.' M. J. Lauder: 'Imprisonment for Debt.' H. W. Wolff: 'Collective Landholding in Italy' and 'Friendly Societies in Italy.'

Revue Biblique Internationale (N.S. Vol. IV. No. 1. January 1907. Paris: Lecoffre). A. van Hoonacker: 'Notes d'exégèse sur quelques

Digitized by Google

passages difficiles d'Osée.' Hos. iv 4–5, 18; v 1, 2, 11; vi 8–9; vii 3–7; viii 6; ix 13. H. Coppieters: 'Le Décret des Apôtres (Acts xv 28–9).' P. Dhorme: 'Le séjour des morts chez les Babyloniens et les Hébreux.' Mgr G. Mercati: (1) 'S. Isicius'; (2) 'I frammenti esaplari del *Chronicon Paschale*'; (3) 'Lo Scritto Atanasiano *De Asymis* è spurio.' M. J. Lagrange: 'Le Livre de la Sagesse, sa doctrine des fins dernières.' M. Abel: 'Notes d'archéologie chrétienne sur le Sinaï.' Illustrated. R. Savignac: 'Création d'un sanctuaire et d'une tradition à Jérusalem'; 'Les fouilles de Megiddo.' Reviews. A. Condamin: 'Briggs *Psalms*, I (*Int. Crit. Comm.*).' P. Dhorme: 'J. de Morgan *Recherches archéologiques en Perse*.' H. Vincent: 'Petrie *Researches in Sinai*.' 'Heigl *Verfasser u. Adresse des Briefes an die Hebräer*.' 'E. A. Abbott *Johannine Grammar*.

Revue Bénédictine (Vol. XXIV. No. 1. January 1907. Maredsous). D. De Bruyne: 'Prologues bibliques d'origine Marcionite.' H. Schuster: 'L'abbaye de Farfa et sa restauration au XI^e siècle.' G. Morin: 'Un critique en liturgie au XII^e siècle. Le traité inédit d'Hervé de Bourgdieu *De correctione quarundam Lectionum*'; 'A propos des fragments grecs de Jérôme sur les Psaumes, publiés dans les *Anecdota Maredsolana*'; 'Notes d'hagiographie toscane.' V. Berlière: 'Les évêques auxiliaires de Thérouanne'; 'Une lettre de Frédéric de Laroche, évêque d'Acre et archevêque de Tyr, 1153–1161'; 'Statuts du Chapitre général bénédictin de la province de Sens, Mai 1299.' P. de Meester: 'Le *Filioque*. Étude de théologie orthodoxe.' H. Quentin: 'Un témoignage sur le *Codex Corvinianus* des Épîtres de S. Ignace'; 'Jean de Jérusalem et le Commentaire sur les Évangiles attribué à Théophile d'Antioche.' I. Guidi: 'La liste inédite des diptyques de la Liturgie de Lucques à l'époque lombarde.' Reviews. B. Lebbe: 'A. d'Alès *La Théologie de S. Hippolyte*.' P. Bastien: 'Galante *Fontes iuris canonici selecti*.' U. Berlière: 'Grisac *Histoire de Rome et des Papes au Moyen Age*, I.'

Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique (Vol. VIII. No. 1. January 1907. Louvain). A. d'Alès: 'L'auteur de la *Passio Perpetuae*.' Tertullian. P. Fournier: 'Étude sur les Fausses Décrétales, V' (*fin*). A. Fierens: 'La question franciscaine. Le MS. II. 2326 de la Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, I.' L. Willaert: 'Négociations politico-religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays-Bas catholiques (1598–1625). II. L'intervention des Archiducs en faveur du catholicisme en Angleterre.' Reviews. J. Flamion: 'Grutzmacher *Hieronymus*' et 'Turmel *S. Jérôme*.' M. Vaes: 'Keller *Die sieben römischen Pfalzrichter im byzantinischen Zeitalter*.' J. Warichez: 'Moeller *Histoire du Moyen Âge*.' P. de Puniet: 'Magistretti *Manuale Ambrosianum*.' J. B. Goetstouwers: 'Launay *Journal d'André Ly, prêtre chinois, missionaire et notaire apostolique*, 1746–63, texte latin.'

Analecta Bollandiana (Vol. XXVI. No. 1. January 1907. Brussels). P. Peeters: 'Une version arabe de la Passion de S. Catherine d'Alexandrie.' From a MS. found at Homs in 1902. G. Vielhaber: 'De Codice hagiographico C. R. Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis Lat. 420 (olim Salisburg. 39).' Of Ninth, not Eleventh Century, and important. H. Moretus: 'Les deux anciennes Vies de S. Grégoire le Grand.' The Life by Bede and that by the Monk of Whitby are *independent*. A. Poncelet: 'Les Miracles de S. Willibrord.' H. Delehaye: 'Le Témoignage

Digitized by Google

des Martyrologes.' Reviews. P. P[eeters]: 'Duchesne *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, I'; 'Nau *Histoires d'Ahoudemmeh et de Maronta* (Patr. Or. III.).' H. D[elehaye]: 'Harnack *Lukas der Arzt, Mission und Ausbreitung, Militia Christi.*' V[an] O(rtroy]: 'Pastor *Geschichte der Papste*, IV Leo X.'

Revue des Questions Historiques (Vol. XLI. No. 161. January 1907. Paris). P. Allard: 'Une grande fortune romaine au V^e siècle.' H. Baraude: 'Le siège d'Orléans et Jeanne d'Arc' (*fin*). M. Dubruel: 'Innocent XI et l'extension de la Régale, d'après la correspondance confidentielle du Cardinal Pio avec Léopold I^er^). Pietsch: 'Un prêtre français en exil. L'abbé Gabriel Henry, curé d'Iéne (1795–1815) et ses relations avec Napoléon I^er^.' V. Ermoni: 'Lucius *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in den christlichen Kirche.*' Pierling: 'Dmitri dit le Faux d'après Waliszewski *Les Origines de la Russie Moderne.*' H. de Landosle: 'Lettre inédite de S. Vincent de Paul à Magdeleine de Lamoignon, 1652.' Reviews. 'Martini-Bassi *Catalogus codd. Graec. biblioth. Ambrosianae.*' 'A. d'Alès *La Théologie de S. Hippolyte.*' J. M. Besse: 'Monceaux *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*: III. *Le IV^e^ siècle.*' M. Besnier: 'Allard *Dix Leçons sur le Martyre.*' G. Péries: 'Knect *System des Justinianischen Kirchenvermogensrechtes.*' P. Allard: 'Leclercq *Les Martyrs*, IV–V.'

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses (Vol. XI. 6–XII. 1. November 1906–February 1907. Paris: Picard). P. de Labriolle: 'L'argument de prescription, II.' A. Dupin: 'La Trinité dans l'école modaliste jusqu'à la fin du III^e^ siècle.' M. Masson: 'Fénelon et Mme Guyon. I. La Correspondance secrète. II. (Jan.-Feb.) Histoire d'une amitié mystique.' A. Loisy: 'Chronique Biblique.' Jan.-Feb. L. de la Vallée Poussin: '*Introduction à la pratique des futurs Bouddhas*, par Cantideva' (*suite*). A. Loisy: 'Wellhausen *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien.*' Lengthy notice.

Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique (December 1906–March 1907. Paris: Lecoffre). L. Maisonneuve: 'La philosophie religieuse de M. Brunetière' (*suite* Jan.-Feb.) Mgr. Batiffol: 'L'édit de Calliste d'après une controverse récente.' January. 'Brunschvieg *L'idéalisme contemporain.*' February. J. Mahé: 'La date du commentaire de S. Cyrille sur S. Jean.' 'Prat *Origène, le théologien et l'exégète.*' 'J. Martin *Gustave Wasa et la réforme en Suède.*' March. A. Degert: 'Une œuvre nouvelle de S. Irénée.' E. Albert: 'Mar Qiore, L'Eucharistie chez les Nestoriens au VI^e^ siècle.' 'Lecanuet *L'Église de France sous la III^e^ république*, 1870–78.'

Studi Religiosi (Vol. VI. No. 6–VII. 1. November 1906–February 1907. Firenze). F. Mari: 'La dimora dei morti presso i Babilonesi e gli antichi Ebrei.' D. Battaini: 'Il rinascimento cattolico in Inghilterra.' S. Minocchi: (1) 'Il P. Tyrrell e la sua *Lettera confidenziale* (Un conflitto tra la Fede e la Teologia?).' (2) Ipnotismo e Spiritismo.' 'Religione e superstizione.' Reviews. 'Schell *Apologie des Christentums.*' 'Profumo *Le fonti e i tempi dell' Incendio Neroniano.*' 'Schmidt *Acta Pauli.*' 'Künstle *Anti-Priscilliana.*' 'Monceaux *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, III–IV.' 'Burn *Niceta of Remesiana.*' 'Baudrillart *Quatre cents ans de Concordat.*' S. Minocchi: 'Versione di Isaia, lvii 14–lx 21.' January–February. G. Semeria: 'Chi ha scritto *l'Imitazione di Cristo*?' L. Franceschi: 'La Biologia moderna e la ipotesi dell' Evoluzione.' L. Caetani di Teano: 'Bisanzio e la Chiesa orientale alla vigilia della Invasione

Digitized by Google

araba.' Reviews. 'Briggs and Von Hügel *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch.*' 'Dudden *Gregory the Great.*' S. Minocchi: Genesi, i–ii 4.'

Teologisk Tidsskrift (Vol. VIII. No. 1. 1906. Copenhagen). A. Mollerup: 'David Hume. En Taenkersaga fra Rationalismens Tid.' V. L. Petersen: 'Kulturkampen i Frankrig.' F. Torm: J. Weiss *Das älteste Evangelium*' and 'Hoffmann *Das Marcusevangelium u. seine Quellen.*' C. T. Lund: 'Christensen *Pauli Liv fortalt og Pauli Brev til Romerne.*'

The East and the West (Vol. V. No. 17. January 1907. S.P.G.). Bp. Montgomery: 'Canada.' Sir T. Holdich: 'Characteristics of the Afghan.' Bp. of Madras: 'The Progress of Christianity in India and Mission Strategy.' E. F. Brown: 'Mission Work among the Educated Classes in India.' Bp. of Rangoon: 'The Indian Empire and the Church of England, or some Claims of the Indian Empire on the Church and the Church's Answer.' E. S. Oakley: 'Missions and Modern Hinduism.' W. S. Macgowan: 'Some Aspects of Education in S. Africa.' G. Whitehead: 'Buddhism in Burma.' Reviews. 'D. Kidd *Savage Childhood: a Study of Kafir Children.*' 'W. G. Aston *Shinto.*' 'J. D. Parsons *The Nature and Purpose of the Universe.*'

Books Received.

The more important will be reviewed in Short Notices or Articles as space permits.

Biblical and Kindred Studies.

Allen, W. C.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew.* 'International Critical Commentary.' Pp. xcvi + 338. (T. and T. Clark.) 12*s.*

Briggs, C. A., and E. G.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms.* Vol. II. 'International Critical Commentary.' Pp. viii + 572. (T. and T. Clark.) 10*s.* 6*d.*

Chamberlain, J. S. ff.—*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle newly rendered with Notes.* Pp. 676. (Elliot Stock.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

———— *Gospel Notes.* Pp. ii + 118. (Stock.) 2*s.*

———— *John's Revelation. Being the Vision of St. John Interpreted.* Pp. 128. (Stock.) 1*s.*

Cornill, C.—*Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament.* Translated by G. H. Box. 'Theological Translation Library,' Vol. XXIII. Pp. xii + 556. (Williams and Norgate.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Du Bose, W. P.—*The Gospel according to St. Paul.* Pp. viii + 304. (Longmans.) 5*s.* net.

'Interpreter.'—*The Fourfold Portrait of the Heavenly King as presented in the Gospels.* A New Translation of the Gospels side by side with the Authorised and Revised Versions, Quotations from the Old Testament Scriptures, and Parallel Passages arranged to facilitate Comparison of the Gospel Narratives. Pp. xvi + 306. (Elliot Stock.) 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

Knight, H. J. C.—*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and Philemon.* 'Churchman's Bible.' Pp. xii + 208. (Methuen.) 2*s.* net.

Leipoldt, J.—*Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. I. Die Entstehung.* Pp. viii + 288. (Leipzig: Hinrichs.) 3 m. 60. See Article.

Digitized by Google

MAYOR, J. B.—*The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter.* Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Comments. Pp. xvi+cciv+240. (Macmillan.) 14*s.* net.

'MOIRA.'—*The Cryptogram and its Key in the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia.* Pp. 106. (Elliot Stock.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

PRICE, I. M.—*The Ancestry of our English Bible: an Account of the Bible Versions, Texts, and Manuscripts.* Pp. xxiv+330. (Philadelphia: Sunday School Times Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

PUSEY, E. B. (the late).—*The Minor Prophets with a Commentary Explanatory and Practical, and Introductions to the Several Books.* Vol. IV. Micah. Vol. V. Jonah and Nahum. Pp. 300, 332. (Nisbet.) 2*s.* 6*d.* each net. Two more volumes of a very cheap reprint.

ROUND, D.—*The Date of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.* Pp. viii+72. (Cambridge University Press.) 2*s.* net.

SALMON, G. (the late).—*The Human Element in the Gospels.* A Commentary on the Synoptic Narrative. Edited by N. J. D. WHITE. Pp. xxiv+550. (Murray.) 18*s.* net. See Article.

SMITH, SIR W.—*A Smaller Dictionary of the Bible for the use of Schools and Young Persons.* With Maps and Illustrations. Pp. vi+618. (Murray.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net. Extraordinarily cheap.

WORKMAN, G. C.—*The Servant of Jehovah; or, the Passion Prophecy of Scripture analysed and elucidated.* Pp. xxvi+250. (Longmans.) 5*s.* net.

PHILOSOPHY AND APOLOGETICS.

ASHWIN, C. G.—*Thoughts about God, Man, Evil, and Kindred Subjects.* Pp. 44. (Elliot Stock.) 2*s.* net.

LE DANTEC, F.—*The Nature and Origin of Life in the Light of New Knowledge.* With an Introductory Preface by R. K. DUNCAN. Pp. xvi+250. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6*s.* net.

MITCHELL, W.—*Structure and Growth of the Mind.* Pp. xxxvi+512. (Macmillan.) 10*s.* net.

PRATT, J. B.—*The Psychology of Religious Belief.* Pp. xii+328. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROGERS, A. K.—*The Religious Conception of the World: an Essay in Constructive Philosophy.* Pp. vi+286. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

SCHILLER, F. C. S.—*Studies in Humanism.* Pp. xviii+492. (Macmillan.) 10*s.* net.

TURTON, LT.-COL. W. H.—*The Truth of Christianity, being an Examination of the more Important Arguments for and against Believing in that Religion.* Sixth Edition, carefully revised throughout. Pp. viii+570. (Wells Gardner.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net. Interesting, useful, and very cheap, but still not quite fair to the 'Higher Critics.'

CHURCH HISTORY.

BRUCE, H.—*The Age of Schism.* Being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 1304 to A.D. 1503. Pp. viii+278. (Rivingtons.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net. 'The Church Universal,' Vol. V.

LEA, H. C.—*A History of the Inquisition of Spain.* Vol. III. Pp. xii+576. (The Macmillan Co.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Digitized by Google

LINDSAY, T. M.—*A History of the Reformation.* Vol. II. The Reformation in Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, Scotland, and England. The Anabaptist and Socinian Movements. The Counter-Reformation. 'International Theological Library.' Pp. xviii+632. (T. and T. Clark.) 10*s.* 6*d.*

PLUMMER, A.—*English Church History from the Death of Charles I. to the Death of William III.* (1649–1702). Four Lectures. Pp. xii+188. (T. and T. Clark.) 3*s.* net.

ROMANES, E.—*The Story of Port Royal.* Pp. xxiv+504. (Murray.) 15*s.* net.

WHITNEY, J. P.—The Reformation. Being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 1503 to A.D. 1648. Pp. viii+502. (Rivingtons.) 5*s.* net. 'The Church Universal,' Vol. VI.

DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

ALLEN, A. V. G.—*Freedom in the Church; or, the Doctrine of Christ as the Lord hath Commanded, and as this Church hath Received the same according to the Commandments of God.* Pp. xvi+224. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

ECK, H. U. S.—*Sin.* 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.' Pp. xii+242. (Longmans.) 5*s.*

LODGE, SIR O.—*The Substance of Faith allied with Science.* A Catechism for Parents and Teachers. Pp. xii+136. (Methuen.) 2*s.* net.

MCNABB, V.—*The Decrees of the Vatican Council.* Edited with an Introduction. Pp. 48. (Burns and Oates.) 2*s.* net.

MOBERLY, R. C. (the late).—*Atonement and Personality* and *Ministerial Priesthood.* Pp. xxviii+418, lvi+360. (Murray.) 6*s.* each net. Two admirable re-issues at a cheaper price.

The Religion of a Layman. Being Studies of various subjects—the Serious Reflections of a Long Life. Together with a Review of the Westminster Confession of Faith. Pp. iv+226. (Edinburgh: Waddie and Co.) 5*s.* net.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

BARING-GOULD, S.—*The Restitution of All Things; or, 'The Hope that is set before us.'* Pp. 182. (Skeffingtons.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

———————— and others. Plain Sermons on Sunday Observance. With Prefatory Note by H. B. OTTLEY. Pp. 94. (Skeffingtons.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

BUSSELL, F. W.—*Christian Theology and Social Progress.* The Bampton Lectures for 1905. Pp. xl+344. (Methuen.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

HANKEY, W. B. (the late).—*The Church and the Saints.* Edited by M. K. C. STRONG. Pp. xvi+194. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

HEPHER, C.—*The Self-Revelation of Jesus.* Pp. viii+116. (Wells Gardner.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

HOLLAND, H. S.—*Vital Values.* Pp. viii+228. (Wells Gardner.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

INGE, W. R.—*Personal Idealism and Mysticism.* The Paddock Lectures for 1906 delivered at the General Seminary, New York. Pp. x+186. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Digitized by Google

KNIGHT, H. J. C.—*The Temptation of our Lord considered as related to the Ministry and as a Revelation of His Person.* 'Hulsean Lectures, 1905–6.' Pp. xiv+210. (Longmans.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

LUCKOCK, VERY REV. H. M. (Dean of Lichfield).—*Eucharistic Sacrifice and Intercession for the Departed both Consistent with the Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer.* A Course of Addresses. Pp. xvi+134. (Skeffingtons.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

MONTGOMERY, C. P. G.—*Some Aspects of the Blessed Eucharist.* Five Sermons. Pp. 52. (Masters.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

MORTIMER, A. G.—*One Hundred Miniature Sermons.* Being a very full Outline Sermon on the Epistles and Gospels for all the Sundays, Holy Days, and Saints' Days of the Christian Year. Part II. Ash Wednesday to Trinity Sunday. Pp. 161–342. (Skeffingtons.) 2*s.* net.

TAYLOR, F. J.—*The Apostle of Patience and Practice: a Simple Exposition of the Epistle of St. James.* In xiv. Short Addresses delivered at St. Matthew's, Redhill. Pp. 172. (Allenson.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

WATSON, F. (the late).—*The Seven Words from the Cross: a Course of Meditations.* Edited by C. B. DRAKE. Pp. 112. (Skeffingtons.) 2*s.* net.

WILMOT-BUXTON, H. J.—*God's Heroes.* A Series of Plain Sermons. 'Sermon Library, Vol. VII.' Pp. x+234. (Skeffingtons.) 2*s.* net.

WILSON, J. M.—*The Day School and Religious Education.* Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1*d.* Preached in Worcester Cathedral, January 6, 1907.

DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

ATWOOL, H. C.—*At His Feet: the Place of Faith in the Incarnate Word.* Pp. x+164. (Wells Gardner.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

BRETT, J.—*The Altar and the Life: Meditations on the Blessed Sacrament in Relation to the Development of the Spiritual Life.* Pp. x+216. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

GOOCH, W. F.—*The Christian Union Hymnal.* New edition, revised, with Supplement. Pp. 200. (London: Morgan and Scott.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

MACLEAN, F.—*Sunrise.* Pp. 56. (Wells Gardner.) 1*s.* Chiefly Texts.

MATURIN, B. W.—*Laws of the Spiritual Life.* Pp. vi+282. (Longmans.) 5*s.* net.

NUTTALL, MOST REV. E. (Archbishop of the West Indies).—*Catechisms and Devotions for Children and Young People.* Pp. 96. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

SLATTERY, VERY REV. C. L.—*The Master of the World: a Study of Christ.* Pp. viii+298. (Longmans.) 5*s.* net.

TEE, E.—*The Sanctuary of Suffering.* With Preface by (the late) J. P. F. DAVIDSON. New edition. Pp. xii+220. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

TYRRELL, G.—*Oil and Wine.* Reissue with a new Preface. Pp. xx+352. (Longmans.) 5*s.* net.

LAWRENCE, BROTHER.—*The Spiritual Maxims of Brother Lawrence, together with his Character and Gathered Thoughts.* Newly translated. 'Heart and Life' series. Pp. 58. (Allenson.) 1*s.* net.

PORTER, R.—*In Quietness and Confidence. Looking towards Sunrise. Open Windows. Resting in His Love.* Pp. 118, 108, 114, 148. (Moring.) 1*s.* each net. Four little books in the 'Quiet Hour' series.

ROSS, G. A. J.—*The Universality of Jesus.* Pp. 182. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Digitized by Google

WALSHAM HOW, BISHOP (the late).—*Pastor in Parochia.* Pp. xii + 464. (Wells Gardner.) 3*s.* 6*d.* A beautiful little pocket edition on thin paper with added services and prayers.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

BEACHEY, R. W.—*God, Man, and the Garden : Puzzles, Problems and Parables solved by the Word of God.* Pp. xii + 270. (Elliot Stock.) 5*s.*

BRASTOW, L. O.—*The Modern Pulpit : a Study of Homiletic Sources and Characteristics.* Pp. xxiv + 452. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

HARNACK, A., and HERRMANN, W.—*Essays on the Social Gospel.* Translated by G. M. CRAIK. 'Crown Theological Library.' Pp. x + 226. (Williams and Norgate.) 4*s.* 6*d.*

HILTY, C.—*The Steps of Life : Further Essays on Happiness.* Translated by M. BRANDOW, with an Introduction by F. G. PEABODY. Pp. x + 264. (The Macmillan Co.) 5*s.* net.

SLICER, T. R.—*The Way to Happiness.* Pp. viii + 172. (The Macmillan Co.) 5*s.* net.

HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.

The Cambridge Modern History. Vol. IV. *The Thirty Years' War.* Pp. xxx + 1004. (Cambridge University Press.) 16*s.* net. See Notice.

FARNELL, L. R.—*The Cults of the Greek States,* Vols. III. and IV. Pp. xii + 394, viii + 454. (Clarendon Press.) 32*s.* net.

INNES, A. D.—*History of England for the use of Schools.* Pp. xvi + 606. (Cambridge University Press.) 4*s.* 6*d.*

JONES, E. A.—*The Old Church Plate of the Isle of Man.* Pp. xxxii + 34. (Bemrose.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

LETHABY, W. R.—*Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen : a Study of Mediæval Building.* Pp. xvi + 382. (Duckworth.) 12*s.* 6*d.* net. See Article.

SOUTTAR, R.—*A Short History of Mediæval Peoples from the Dawn of the Christian Era to the Fall of Constantinople.* Pp. viii + 682. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 12*s.*

BIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

ADDAMS, J.—*Newer Ideals of Peace.* 'Citizen's Library.' Pp. xviii + 244. (The Macmillan Co.) 5*s.* net.

BREMOND, H.—*The Mystery of Newman.* Translated by H. C. CORRANCE. With an Introduction by G. TYRRELL. Pp. xviii + 360. (Williams and Norgate.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

DALE, E.—*National Life and Character in the Mirror of Early English Literature.* Pp. xiv + 338. (Cambridge University Press.) 8*s.* net.

GRIER, G.—*Our Sister Beatrice : Recollections of Beatrice Jullian Allen and her Letters.* Pp. x + 296. (Longmans.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

HOUTIN, A.—*La Crise du Clergé.* Pp. 348. (Paris : E. Nourry.) 3 fr. 50.

MAETERLINCK, M.—*Life and Flowers.* Translated by A. TEIXEIRA DE MATTOS. Pp. viii + 312. (George Allen.) 5*s.* net.

SANDFORD, VEN. E. G.—*The Exeter Episcopate of Archbishop Temple,* 1869–1885. Pp. xiv + 366. (Macmillan.) 5*s.* net. A reissue of part of the *Memoirs of Archbishop Temple.*

Digitized by Google

WEALE, B. L. P.—*The Truce in the East and its Aftermath.* Being the sequel to *The Reshaping of the Far East.* Pp. xvi+648. (Macmillan.) 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

BATHE, A.—*Eastertide with Jesus.* Pp. viii+152. (Longmans.) 6*d.*

BULKELEY, H. J.—*The Religious Teaching of English History in Church and School.* A paper read at the Carlisle Diocesan Conference, 1890, republished, with a few Alterations, an Introduction, an Appendix containing some National Hymns and Psalms and a Preface by the BISHOP OF HEREFORD. Pp. 24. (Elliot Stock.) 1*s.* net.

DALE, R. W. (the late).—*History of English Congregationalism.* Completed and edited by A. W. W. DALE. Pp. xii+788. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 12*s.* net.

DEARMER, P.—*The Parson's Handbook.* Containing Practical Directions both for Parsons and others as to the Management of the Parish Church and its services according to the English use, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. With an Introductory Essay on Conformity to the Church of England. Pp. xxii+562. (Frowde.) 6*s.* net. Sixth edition, revised a second time with much additional matter, and with thirty-one illustrations.

FRERE, W. H., and DOUGLAS, C. E.—*Puritan Manifestoes.* A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt with a Reprint of the Admonition to the Parliament and kindred Documents, 1572. 'Church Historical Society,' LXXII. Pp. xxxii+156. (S.P.C.K.) 7*s.* 6*d.*

HYDE, J.—*A Bibliography of the Works of Emanuel Swedenborg, original and translated.* Pp. xviii+744. (Swedenborg Society: 1 Bloomsbury Street, W.C.)

KNIGHT, W.—*On the Art of Public Speaking and Reading.* An Address delivered to the Theological Students of the Bishop of Worcester's College at Hartlebury. Pp. 30. (S.P.C.K.) 2*d.*

MORGAN, T. T. L.—*The Teaching of the Temple; or, the Pictorial Rise of the Catholic Church.* Pp. viii+272. (Rivingtons.)

Proposals for a Voluntary Nobility. Pp. 32. (Samurai Press: Ranworth Hall, Norwich.) 2*s.* net.

RUSSELL, G. W. E.—*A Plea for Easter Offerings.* Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.* 6*d.* per 100.

THACKERAY, F. ST. J.—*Sunday at Marby Castle.* Pp. 58. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

The Convocation Prayer Book. Being the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England. With altered Rubrics, showing what would be the condition of the Book if amended in Conformity with the Recommendations of the Convocations of Canterbury and York contained in Reports presented to Her Majesty the Queen in the Year 1879. Pp. iv+576. (Murray.) 5*s.* net.

The Education Crisis. Letters on the subject by the DEAN OF CANTERBURY, DR. CLIFFORD, and others. Pp. 28. (S.P.C.K.) Reprinted from the *Times*, January 1907.

The Meaning of Religious Education. By W. CUNNINGHAM. Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.) 1*d.*

Digitized by Google

THE

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº CXXVIII. *JULY* 1907.

ART. I.—THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.

1. *Durham University.* 'College Histories' Series. By J. T. FOWLER, D.C.L., F.S.A. (London: F. E. Robinson & Co., 1904.)
2. *Report of the Commissioners appointed for the Purposes of the Durham University Act*, 1861. *Copy of all Evidence taken by the Durham University Commissioners under the Durham University Act*, 1861. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 27 February 1863. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.)
3. *Draft of an Act to make Further Provision with Respect to the University of Durham.*

CANON FOWLER commences his interesting history of the University of Durham with a chapter entitled 'Earlier Foundations.' He mentions the monastic college founded by Bishop Hatfield in the University of Oxford, which came to an end in 1540, and on the site of which Trinity College was founded in 1555. He describes the plan for founding a college in Durham in the reign of Henry VIII.—'a noble scheme, but it was not carried out.' And he summarizes the order issued by Cromwell and his Privy Council in 1657 for the founding of a college in Durham, to which an end was put by '"the blessed Restoration,"

Digitized by Google

as Carlyle calls it in irony, and as some of us call it in deep thankfulness.' Canon Fowler then proceeds to 'The Present Foundation: its Constitution and its Developments.' The first recorded steps towards the foundation of the University were taken in the year 1831 by the Bishop and the Dean and Chapter of Durham; and Canon Fowler is doubtless right in ascribing their action to 'the great and increasing population of the Northern counties, together with their remoteness from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge—the railway system being as yet in its infancy.' There is the less reason for looking for any other motive, because in the movement, in Cromwell's day, for a college in Durham 'stress was laid on the great distance of Oxford and Cambridge,' and on the desirability of raising the general standard of learning in the North. We may take it, in the words of the charter founding the University, that the said University of Durham was 'established under our Royal sanction, and the authority of our Parliament,' in the hope that it might 'under the blessing of Almighty God, prove an eminent source of good to our loving subjects, especially in the Northern parts of our realm of England.'

In fine, though Universities such as those of Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, and Sheffield are often supposed to be the first 'local' Universities which were created in England, as a matter of historical fact the first attempt to create a local University in England was made by the Bishop and the Dean and Chapter of Durham; and if the attempt was, as the early history of the University seems to shew, premature, the fact that the attempt was made is proof of the statesman-like foresight of the ecclesiastics who devised it. The circumstances which militated, at first, against the success of the scheme were not foreseen, and could hardly have been foreseen, by anyone at the time: the railway system was as yet in its infancy and no one could have foretold its effects upon the experiment of trying to create a local University. They are obvious enough now when we look at the number of undergraduates in residence in each of the years from 1841 to

Digitized by Google

1861. In 1841 the number was 72, and in the next seven years it grew steadily until it became 131; then from 131 in 1848 it dropped to 122 in 1850, to 110 in 1853, to 80 in 1857, to 58 in 1850, and to 41—the lowest point—in 1861. 'The constitution of the University,' as Canon Fowler says, 'was modelled on that of Christ Church, Oxford, of which one of its founders, Dr. Smith, had been head'; and Durham, as a local University, competed unsuccessfully with Oxford for undergraduates, who, whether they would or would not have turned to Durham in the absence of railway facilities, preferred to go to Oxford or Cambridge when the railways made it easy for them to do so. So unsuccessful had been this educational experiment that

'in the year 1861, a Return was laid before Parliament, which showed such a condition of the University that, without recourse to a preliminary Commission of Inquiry, an Act of Parliament was passed to provide for the better government and extension of the University.'

The appointment of the Commission of 1861 marks the termination of the first period of the history of the University of Durham; and, as the Commission was appointed to provide for the better government of the University,[1] we must look back to see what actually had been the government which had worked so badly during this period of the University's history.

In 1832 an Act of Parliament was passed which, among other things that it did, vested in the Dean and Chapter of Durham the government of the University, and the order and discipline to be observed therein, according to the regulations which the Dean and Chapter, with the consent of the Bishop, were empowered to make. On July 20, 1835, the Dean and Chapter, with the consent of the Bishop, made regulations 'for the better establishment of the University,' and ordained and prescribed that, under the Bishop as Visitor and the Dean and Chapter as

[1] *Report of the Commissioners appointed for the Purposes of the Durham University Act*, 1861, p. 1.

Digitized by Google

Governors, the affairs of the University should be managed by the Warden, and a Senate and a Convocation. In 1841 an Act of Parliament, based on a draft scheme approved in Chapter, November 20, 1841,[1] was passed which made it lawful for certain property, held partly by the Bishop and partly by the Dean and Chapter in trust for the University, to be transferred to the University by the authority of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The Act also made it

'lawful, by the like Authority,[2] with the Consent of the said University and also of the said Bishop and of the said Dean and Chapter, to transfer to the said Warden, Masters and Scholars the Whole or any Part of the Powers relating to the Government of the said University, and the Order and Discipline to be observed therein which are now vested in the said Dean and Chapter.'

By an Order in Council, gazetted March 15, 1842, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners carried out the Act of 1841 so far as regards the transference of property. As regards the transference of the Powers of Government, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners 'humbly recommend and propose that nothing herein contained shall prevent us from recommending and proposing other measures relating to the University of Durham in conformity with the provisions of the said Act' of 1841. But, though they were and remained at liberty to transfer the Powers of Government from the Dean and Chapter to the Warden, Masters and Scholars, they did not transfer them; and 'the Powers relating to the Government of the said University, and the Order and Discipline to be observed therein' continued to be, and at the present day still are, 'vested in the said Dean and Chapter.'

Thus the University found itself in a strange position: its 'affairs' were to be 'managed' by itself, but the government of the University was to be in the hands of a Dean and Chapter. With responsibility thus divided, there was

[1] Fowler, *Durham University*, p. 24.

[2] 'The authority,' Canon Fowler says, 'of an Order in Council to be issued for the purpose, according to the provisions in Act 3 and 4 Vict., cap. 113, lxxxiii–lxxxv.'

Digitized by Google

no body on whom the duty clearly fell of taking steps to remedy the depletion of the University caused by the development of railways; and the Commission of 1861 was accordingly appointed by Parliament 'to provide for the better government of the University.'

With the Ordinances made for that purpose by the Commission it is unnecessary for us to deal. The Dean and Chapter and the University petitioned against them; and the Ordinances were disallowed. They were disallowed by the Privy Council partly because the Commissioners had proposed to create a School of Physical Science and to introduce the new degrees of Bachelor and Master of Theology—both of which proposals were held to exceed the powers conferred on the Commissioners of 1861—and partly because the Ordinances were held to be inconsistent with the Charter so far as respects the status of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, since the Commissioners had proposed 'to vest in the Senate the whole of the government of the University.' [1]

The Dean and Chapter, having thus successfully demonstrated that the powers of governing the University were in their hands and not in those of the University, had to accept the responsibility which goes with power. Accordingly, in 1865 they framed a Statute of Chapter 'for the improvement and extension of the University.' By that statute they did what the Commissioners had proposed to do but had been ruled to have no power to do: they founded a School of Physical Science; and they made at any rate one regulation about Degrees in Theology, though no degree was actually conferred until many years later. But, having made this statute, Chapter relapsed into the old state of inactivity: for over forty years—from 1865 to the present day—they have neither initiated nor attempted to initiate any change whatever for the improvement or extension of the University, and have confined themselves to resisting the attempts which have been made to transfer to the University the power of governing itself. To those attempts we will recur hereafter in their historical order.

[1] *Report of the Commissioners*, p. 13.

Digitized by Google

The cost, to the undergraduates, of education at Durham had been pronounced by the Commissioners of 1861 to be too great—'we think the charges excessive.' The Chapter accordingly, in their Statute of 1865, decreed that 'the Senate shall take measures forthwith to reduce the expense of students in the University.' The expense was reduced; and two consequences followed. First, the number of undergraduates went up. In 1861 the number was forty-one. By 1870 it had doubled. In 1881 it had doubled again. In 1891 it had increased to 219. In 1906 it increased still more. Next, the character of the University changed: it ceased to be a 'local' University. The undergraduates came from all parts of England; few came, or come now, to Durham from the North-Eastern district. If a chart shewing the number of undergraduates at Durham from year to year be compared with one shewing the fluctuations of British trade, it will be seen that the number of Durham undergraduates follows, and we may reasonably say depends, on the commercial prosperity of the country at large. But, while increasing numbers of undergraduates were coming from all parts of the country to Durham (with the object, in 90 per cent. at least of the cases, of taking Holy Orders), and while the University of Durham was thus coming to meet not a local but a national need, it began in 1871 to perform, in addition, the function of a local University. In that year a College of Physical Science was founded in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and became the School of Physical Science which the Chapter, following the proposal of the Commissioners, had resolved to create. This College of Physical Science was founded, according to the *Durham University Calendar*, 'by the joint co-operation of the University and the leading land proprietors, employers of skilled labour &c. in the North of England.' In 1874 the College was formally incorporated with the University; and 'in 1904 it was agreed that the College of Science should be called Armstrong College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in the University of Durham.' The students of Armstrong College read for degrees in science and for the B.Litt. They come principally from Newcastle and the

Digitized by Google

neighbouring district; and though Engineering and Mining students come from other parts of the country and from foreign countries, the University through Armstrong College performs the work of a local University, while through its Colleges situated in the city of Durham it draws undergraduates from all parts of England and even of the Empire.

We have now to resume the history of the University's struggle to obtain the power of governing itself. The Ordinances of the Commissioners appointed for the purposes of the Durham University Act, 1861, were, as we have said, disallowed, on the petition of the Dean and Chapter and the University. It is noteworthy that in the petition of the University no objection whatever is raised to the transference of government from the Chapter to the University, though many other of the provisions are petitioned against. It is also noteworthy that the Dean—at that time Dr. Waddington—in writing to the Senate (December 23, 1862), said:

'Now the Commission is not empowered by the Act which constitutes it to deprive the Dean and Chapter of that office'—the office of Governors of the University—'and it will be proper to remonstrate against that proceeding. Still, I should advise the Dean and Chapter to cede that position. *To be under the direct control of an Ecclesiastical Body would certainly be injurious to the prospects of a young and liberal institution; and the duties of that office would be better performed by the Senate.*'

The Commissioners, at whose head was the then Bishop of Durham, recorded in their Final Report that '*we think it a matter of the first importance to vest in the Senate the whole of the government of the University.*'

The transference of the powers of government from the Chapter to the Senate, thus laid down alike by the Bishop and the Dean of Durham in 1862 as the objective of movements of reform, has remained so ever since. In 1895 seven members of the Senate—six clerical and one lay—drew up a memorandum giving their reasons for urging that the transference should be made. The memo-

Digitized by Google

randum was drawn up on the suggestion of Bishop Westcott, who, as Visitor of both Chapter and Senate, suggested a conference between the two bodies to consider whether the time had not now come for transferring the power of governing the University from the Chapter to the University itself. There was a strong feeling in the Senate that the relations of the Chapter to the University were in some ways detrimental to its highest efficiency; and, if Bishop Westcott came to the conclusion that it was desirable that the question should be thoroughly discussed at a conference, we may be sure that he came to that conclusion after careful consideration.

The memorandum above mentioned, from members of Senate resident in Durham, desired 'the application of the provisions of the Act of 1841 relating to the government of the University.' It points out that

'the Commission of 1862, and those who opposed its Ordinances, seem alike to have overlooked the existence of the clause [in the Act of 1841, making it lawful to transfer the powers of government from the Dean and Chapter to the University] although an abstract of it is printed in the appendix to the evidence taken by the Commissioners.'

It explains that the 'governing' function of the Chapter resides in the power of the Chapter to make statutes for the University; and it goes on to say:

'A Statute of Chapter is a document in which the University does not appear as a party. The Dean and Chapter (with the consent of the Visitor) "order, ordain, and prescribe," and the University is purely passive. We venture to describe this position, of being passively subject to the legislative action of a non-academic and external corporation, as an abnormal position for a University to occupy. And for a University, and especially a University with its position to win, and threatened with serious competition in winning it, to be abnormally constituted is a serious weakness, and places it in a position of disadvantageous inequality as compared with other Universities. We would add that when this supreme governing corporation is one small in numerical composition, and representative of a single interest, the weakness resulting to the University becomes more serious still.'

Digitized by Google

The memorandum concludes with the words:

'We trust, my Lord, that nothing we have said can be misconstrued as implying the slightest complaint, either as regards the Chapter as a Body, or as regards individuals. The number of men of high character and distinction who have since the foundation of the University been members of the Chapter is enough to convince anyone that the experiment of Chapter Government has been tried under the most favourable personal conditions. Our objection is solely to the system, or rather to its too long continuance. Necessary as a prop to the infant University, with its growth the Chapter government becomes unnecessary; with its further progress, it must become a hindrance; in its future development, a danger. We therefore venture to ask, my Lord, for your consent to a scheme under the Act of 1841, and we confidently appeal to the magnanimity and public spirit of the great historic Chapter of Durham to allow us to rank the present Chapter in our grateful recognition as our benefactors, side by side with our founders, the Chapter of 1832.'

The canons declined to attend the conference to which Bishop Westcott had invited them. The memorandum which they forwarded to the Bishop is not given in Dr. Fowler's book, nor has it, so far as we can discover, been published elsewhere. But we may safely surmise that it was read by Bishop Westcott with great disappointment and regret.

The refusal of the Chapter made the conference impossible. It also made, as was pointed out by Bishop Westcott at the time, an appeal to Parliament inevitable. In 1896 it was open to Chapter to transfer to the University either the whole of the powers relating to the government of the University or such part of them as they might have agreed with the University to transfer under the Act of 1841. The refusal of the Chapter to confer with the University on the matter rendered it impossible to set going the permissive machinery of the Act of 1841; and made it inevitable, therefore, that the power of Parliament should be invoked. The refusal of the Chapter, in 1896, to accept the invitation of Bishop Westcott to confer with him and

Digitized by Google

with the University, has resulted in the Bill which is laid before Parliament in 1907.

In the Memorandum from members of Senate resident in Durham which was presented to the Bishop in 1895, it is pointed out that

> if it be objected that the proposed application of the Act of 1841 would remove a possibly desirable check on the unrestrained legislative action of this University, we think, frankly, that the necessity of such a check is sufficiently provided for by the Power of Consent reserved to the Visitor,'

but, if further check be required—and in the opinion of the signatories it is not—a University Court might be provided for. Here we are at once brought face to face with the peculiar nature of the University of Durham. On the one hand, as regards Newcastle, it is a local University, supplying the needs of the North-Eastern district of England; on the other hand, as regards Durham, it draws from all parts of England undergraduates who desire to take Holy Orders. So far, therefore, as it is a local University, it might be desirable for it to do as other local Universities do, and place itself under a University Court composed of local magnates and appealing to local patriotism. But, in so doing, it would forfeit its national character; and the Durham Colleges, which have been educating an ever-increasing number of candidates for the priesthood, and which do not depend upon local influences for their supply of students, would be emptied if the University were transformed into a local University, governed by a University Court consisting, say, of the leading land proprietors, employers of skilled labour, and representatives of County and other Councils.

This difficulty is turned, by the 'Bill to make further provision with respect to the University of Durham,' in a very simple way: by the first clause of the schedule, 'the Bishop of Durham shall be the Visitor of the University'; by the third clause, 'the office and powers of the Dean and Chapter of Durham as Governors of the University shall cease as soon as this scheme comes into operation'; by the

Digitized by Google

fourth and fifth clauses the power of making regulations for the University is given to the Senate; while the twelfth clause provides that, when appeal is made to Convocation, 'Convocation may veto any resolution of Senate affecting the regulations of the University.' No University Court is created. The University becomes completely autonomous.

If, however, the Dean and Chapter, by the Bill, were deprived of their office and power as Governors, and were simply excluded entirely from the University which was founded by them, the Bill would not meet with the approval of any fair-minded man. Still less could we approve of it if the connexion of the Durham Colleges with the Cathedral Church of Durham were broken by the Bill; or if the property which supports them, and which originally was (in the words of the Act of Parliament of 1832), 'a specific Portion of the Property of the said Cathedral Church,' were diverted from the original purpose of its endowment. But Schedule VI. 5 to the Bill expressly provides that 'always due regard shall be had to the original purpose of the endowment and to its connection with the Cathedral Church of Durham.' Further, the Dean and Chapter, who at the present moment have no control whatever over the endowment—having parted with it in the manner described above on page 260—are to be made, by Schedule VI. of the Bill, members of the body politic and corporate which is to have complete and absolute control over the endowment. This body politic and corporate—which under the name of the Council of the Durham Colleges is to have perpetual succession and a common seal—is to consist of the Dean and Chapter, Heads of Houses, and some other fourteen or more persons; and is to be 'the governing body of the Durham division of the University.' Further, by Schedule VI. 8 'the two canonries of Durham hitherto annexed to Professorships of Divinity and of Greek in the University of Durham shall remain so annexed. Appointments to these Professorships shall be made, as now, by the Lord Bishop of Durham.'

It is indeed with the Senate of the University and not with the Council of the Durham Colleges that the power is

Digitized by Google

to reside (Sched. V. 4) of determining the conditions on which candidates may be admitted to degrees. But that power is limited materially—and advantageously—by Sched. V. 11, which provides that 'no regulation affecting the Faculty of Theology shall as far as the said Faculty is affected thereby be made, amended or abrogated except with the consent of the Council of the Durham Colleges'; and by Sched. V. 17, which forbids the Senate to make any alteration in the regulations affecting students of the Durham division in the matter of residence or study 'without the consent of the Council of the Durham Colleges.'

With the Dean and Chapter members of a Council possessing these powers; with two canons occupying *ex officio* the chairs of Divinity and Greek; with the provision that due regard shall always be had to the original purposes of the endowment and to its connexion with the Cathedral Church of Durham; and with the Lord Bishop of Durham as the Visitor of the University to whom appeal can always be made against any measure that may even appear to be wanting in due regard to the original purpose of the endowment, there seems to be little ground for undue apprehension lest the connexion of the Durham Colleges with the Cathedral Church should be broken, or lest the property which supports them should be diverted from the original purpose of the endowment.

As regards the proposed re-constitution of the Senate, we notice that, as at present the Dean of Durham and the two canons who are *ex officio* Professors of Divinity and Greek are members of Senate in virtue of their offices, so they will continue, of right, to be members of the new Senate. The Senate, as re-constituted, is to consist of the Chancellor of the University and thirty-six other members. The first Chancellor is to be the Very Reverend G. W. Kitchin, Dean of Durham. Twelve members, we may say, are to come from Durham, twelve from the Newcastle Colleges, six are to be appointed by the Crown, and six by the Convocation of the University. Whenever a University is reformed, members of Convocation are naturally and rightly concerned to see that their position is not infringed;

Digitized by Google

it is therefore proper to inquire how Durham graduates are affected by the re-constitution of the Senate. In the Senate as it exists at present there are seventeen members, of whom two are elected by members of Convocation. In the Senate, as re-constituted by the Bill, there are thirty-seven members, of whom six are to be elected by members of Convocation. Thus whereas at present Durham graduates appoint only one ninth of the members of the Senate, in the proposed Senate they will elect one sixth. It appears, then, that both absolutely and relatively members of Convocation gain in power by the change. At present they elect two members of a Senate which does not possess the powers of government; in future they will, by the Bill, elect six members of a Senate which will possess these powers.

As many Theological Colleges are affiliated to the University, it may be well to notice that, by Schedule V. 13, 'without the consent of the Visitor (the Bishop of Durham) Senate shall not abrogate the affiliation of any College now affiliated to the University.'

In this connexion we note that the Bill contemplates the possibility and the probability that the University may desire to affiliate other colleges. As a local University, Durham owes a duty to towns in the North of England which are endeavouring to provide higher education for their children. In many of those towns there are colleges which are on the way to reach the level of University Colleges; and the University of Durham must, if it is to do its duty, be prepared to admit those colleges. The power to admit them it already possesses; and the Bill proposes to ensure that the power shall be properly exercised, and that it shall not be possible for the University, on inadequate grounds, or from mistaken jealousy, to exclude colleges which are fit to be admitted. The Bill therefore provides that the conditions of admission shall not be left to be determined by the University—for the University, or its colleges, might be suspected of intentional or unintentional unfairness—but by the appointed Commissioners. The Commissioners are to make statutes regulating the conditions under which colleges other than those at present

Digitized by Google

connected with the University may become affiliated to it and regulating the procedure of affiliation. The Commissioners are to provide, in particular, for the representation of any colleges thus admitted in future; and they are to provide for an appeal to the Privy Council on the part of any college within the counties of Northumberland, Durham, Cumberland and Westmorland, to which affiliation may have been refused without reasonable and sufficient cause. On the whole, therefore, placing ourselves at the point of view of Technical and other Colleges which desire that they may become part of the University of Durham when they are, in the opinion of disinterested judges, fit to be admitted, we feel that the approach has been made both broad and smooth for them.

To turn from the effects which the Bill may have upon colleges not yet part of the University to the effects which it may have upon the Colleges at present comprised within it: it is of course not improbable that one of the consequences which will follow, if the Bill becomes law, will be that students of the University in Newcastle will be admitted to the B.A. without being required to know any Greek. If so, Bishops will need to ascertain whether a man holding the Durham B.A. has studied Greek, and whether he has 'resided' in the University in the sense in which 'residence' is understood both in the older Universities and in Durham, though not in Newcastle. To enable Bishops to ascertain this unmistakeably it is provided by Schedule X. 3 that 'the privilege of appending the words "*in litteris antiquis*" to the title of their degrees shall be open only to those graduates in arts who have pursued in the Durham division of the University a curriculum which has included both Latin and Greek.' A simple inspection, therefore, of the parchment testifying that a man is a B.A. of the University of Durham will shew whether the B.A. is a B.A. *in litteris antiquis*, and therefore whether the man has resided in Durham and taken Latin and Greek for his degree.

It remains finally to examine these proposed changes from the point of view of the interests of the University

Digitized by Google

and of the Church of England; for that the Church of England has rightly a voice in the constitution of Durham University cannot be doubted. The University was definitely founded with money belonging to the Church of England, and for the sake of training clergy for the Church. To interfere with this purpose would be most improper; but though the Church has rightly this interest in the University—an interest which the Bill endeavours to safeguard in every way—that is no excuse for an attempt on the part of the Church to interfere with the self-government of the University.

We had better begin with the essential point—the abolition of the existing powers of the Dean and Chapter of Durham. We do not think that there can be any real doubt that this is most desirable. All experience in the past has shewn that this submission of a University to ecclesiastical authority is almost invariably disastrous. The Dean and Chapter may be an excellent body for governing a Cathedral, but they are not in their corporate capacity in any way fitted for governing a University. Nor is the continuance of their authority in any way desirable for the Church: it will produce nothing but resentment. It is as improper for the University to be subjected to ecclesiastical authority as it would for the Church to be governed by a municipality or by the State. Each has its own function to perform and ought to be left to do it independently. In the interests, therefore, both of the University and of the Church we heartily welcome this proposed change. But we have a further right to ask whether the attitude of the University as re-constituted will be favourable to the conditions on which the University was founded. It is well known that in recent years as a reaction from the old conditions in which the Universities were hampered by religious tests or subservience to ecclesiastical authority newer Universities and University Colleges have grown up with strong anti-clerical tests. They are debarred from giving theological degrees or making theological appointments. This is an entirely wrong position. A University, being a free and self-governing body, ought to be left free

Digitized by Google

to manage its own religious affairs without being hampered by Acts of Parliament or Trust deeds. From this point of view there has been a gradual improvement of recent years. Thus, the University of London, for example, in its newly constituted form has lost a great deal of its old religious narrowness, and the Victoria University at Manchester has formed a Theological Faculty. What we should aim at is religious freedom. From this point of view the new Bill marks a distinct advance. In § V. 2 of the Schedule it is stated that 'except in the Faculty of Theology the Senate shall not require or impose any religious test unless in its capacity of trustee of a benefaction to which such a condition had been attached by its foundation.' We are gradually approaching religious liberty. The University of Durham is not going to be so foolish as the University College at Bangor, which had to give up a bequest of quite a proper character because very broad religious restrictions were attached to its receipt. Durham will be free also to develop for any religious body both religious teaching and religious worship in connexion with the Faculty of Theology. This clause therefore, so far as we can see, guarantees very complete religious liberty. As regards the Durham Colleges, they are to be carried on in accordance with the intentions with which they were founded, and that, again, ought to leave them perfect freedom for fulfilling their religious functions. We thus think that in the main points of the re-constitution of the University the arrangements are satisfactory.

On one point, we venture to think, a change might have been made. For many years past a sum of 1,260*l.* a year has been paid out of the funds of the Durham Colleges towards the Armstrong College at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. When this payment was first made there were no Treasury subsidies for University Colleges; and it would be a reasonable proposal, we cannot but think, that now that the Newcastle College is in receipt of large grants, and has received adequate endowments of its own, this sum should be returned to the Durham Colleges. It is quite true, as the promoters of the Bill state, that nothing is given away by this Act: that the

Digitized by Google

grant was made many years ago; but circumstances have changed since then, and we believe that it would do away with a good deal of friction if the Durham Colleges were allowed to retain their own property.

The next question which will be asked is, Does the proposed constitution guarantee to the University proper independence and autonomy? We venture to think it does, and so far as regards the constitution of the University it seems to us quite satisfactory. The Bishop of Durham, quite rightly remembering the old traditions of the Palatinate and the origin of the University, retains his position as Visitor, with certain powers of veto. There are opportunities for an appeal to Convocation, Convocation being rightly a conservative body which fences the traditions of the University. The Senate contains a proper proportion of representatives of teachers, of administrators and of graduates. Altogether the constitution seems to us well thought out. We are not quite certain whether we can say the same, however, about the constitution of the Council of the Durham Colleges. It is quite right that the Dean and Chapter should be members of it, but we are bound to say that we consider the representation of teachers upon it to be most inadequate, and we should certainly like to see the number of those thus elected increased from three to six. Unless the actual teachers are adequately represented upon the governing bodies of Universities and Colleges there is a very serious danger that the interests of educational progress and learning may be neglected. The Universities are carried on in the interests of administration and not in the interests of teaching. To any thoughtful person at the present day the elaborate arrangements for organizing education, the large sums of money spent upon officials and administrators, and the time devoted to these external paraphernalia must create great misgivings. It is much more important to pay a person properly and set him down to teach than it is to make elaborate rules and restrictions which have often very little relation to the actual work of the teacher. We should hope, therefore, that the teaching staff will be

Digitized by Google

more largely represented on the governing body of the Colleges, and we trust that the Council which has by Sched. VI. 1. the power of co-opting three persons will have the wisdom regularly to co-opt three members of the teaching staff.

There remains a third point to discuss. How far is it possible out of two heterogeneous bodies situated in two cities nearly twenty miles apart to create one homogeneous University? The essence of a University is intellectual life. Will there be this in Durham in the future? So far as regards the two separate portions the arrangements proposed mark a distinct step in advance. The present Durham Colleges and any new ones that are founded will be grouped together with identity of interests and identity of life. It is suggested further that a union should take place on the other side of the Armstrong College and the Medical School at Newcastle. This again is most desirable. But how will it be possible to harmonize Durham and Newcastle? Can unity be created out of them, or will they be two unequally yoked horses pulling different ways, and only kept together by an elaborately balanced Senate? We believe that on the whole it will be possible to obtain a considerable amount of unity. For all practical purposes Durham and Newcastle are no further apart than one side of London is from another. It will be easy for students in one College to attend the best lectures at the other. We venture to think that special arrangements might be made with the railway company by which members of the University could travel backward and forward at very much reduced fares. It is not so difficult, for example, to pass from the University of Durham to the Armstrong College at Newcastle as it is from the East London College to the place at present used for the University of London. We hope, therefore, that there may grow up in Durham and Newcastle a strong centre of intellectual life, and that when, as is proposed, the various restrictions have been removed which would necessarily cause irritation to the Newcastle Colleges and they are free to give their own instruction in Arts as well as in Science

Digitized by Google

and Technology, a healthy rivalry will take the place of any sort of suspicion. We certainly believe that both Colleges have a future before them. Durham has traditions of ecclesiastical and archæological knowledge which might be developed in the future. Newcastle is the great Northern centre of industry, and ought to be a home of instruction in pure and applied science. We believe that it would be wise if the Northern educational authorities were to make Durham the great centre for the training of their teachers, who might there obtain a University degree and University life. The advantages to education would be very great. The University is, we believe, most hospitable to members of other religious bodies, and we feel that a great school of theological training might be built up under the shadow of St. Cuthbert's shrine on the banks of the Wear.

Two things we would plead. The first is that the newly constituted Durham University should make its Matriculation standard approximate to that of other Universities. We are glad to think that an advance towards this has been made in the examination for matriculation in the Faculties of Medicine, Science, Letters and Music. The University should become the centre of educational life for the four Northern counties, and it should help to set a standard for all the Secondary schools within its area by having an adequate matriculation or school-leaving examination. There is no need that this should slavishly copy other models. It may very reasonably exact a lower standard in mathematics than so many Universities aim at, but it must compensate for this by excellence in other subjects. The result of recent conferences has, we hope, made it clear that there is no need for uniformity. What we desire is that all Universities should maintain an adequate standard and should not lower the value of the degree by lowering unduly the severity of the entrance examination. We should like the Durham University degree to be one which could be accepted by any other University. Nothing, however, in this need interfere with the privileges of entrance granted to those who have studied for two years at the Theological Colleges. That privilege is probably

Digitized by Google

a very wise one. It encourages the future study of those who have been inadequately educated earlier, and two years of the study of theology may quite reasonably be considered to exempt from an entrance examination. No one would join a Theological College in order to obtain a degree on easy terms.

The other point which we would like to emphasize is that we cannot help thinking that both Durham and Newcastle might make greater efforts to raise their standard of real learning. Durham has done useful work. It has educated many people who could not have been educated otherwise; but somehow or other it has always failed to attain its right ideal. It has not produced so many distinguished theologians as it should have done: it has not created a great school of theology for the Church of England. It might also, we think, have created a school of archæology, of antiquities and of English history. It has had the men who might have done this, and has hardly known how to use them. There have been distinguished archæologists in Durham who would have adorned a Chair in any University. But there has been a want of really serious interest in the advancement of learning, and we cannot help feeling that this has been partly due to the deadening influence of the Dean and Chapter. The same is true of Newcastle. We do not associate the Newcastle College with any great scientific eminence. Its Medical school is a good one, its technical work is good, but it has not produced, so far as we are aware, or helped to develop, as distinguished men as some of the other newer Universities have done. We hope that under their new constitution both the Colleges will develop a loftier intellectual ambition.

Digitized by Google

ART. II. ST. DAVID AND THE EARLY WELSH SAINTS.

1. *An Essay on the Welsh Saints.* By the Rev. RICE REES, M.A. (London, 1836.)
2. *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints.* By the Rev. W. J. REES, M.A., F.S.A. (Llandovery: The Welsh MSS. Society, 1853.)
3. *A Dissertation on the Pelagian Heresy.* By the Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS, M.A. (Carmarthen, 1808.)
4. *History and Antiquities of St. David's.* By Dr. BASIL JONES, Bishop of St. David's, and Professor E. A. FREEMAN. (London, 1856.)
5. *A Tour in Wales.* By THOMAS PENNANT. (London, 1778.)
6. *Diocesan History of Llandaff.* By the Rev. E. J. NEWELL, M.A. (London: S.P.C.K., 1902.)
7. *The Celtic Church of Wales.* By J. WILLIS BUND. (London: D. Nutt, 1897.)
8. *Wales.* 'Story of the Nations' Series. By O. M. EDWARDS. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1901.)

And many other works.

THE age of complete independence enjoyed by the early Cambro-British Church may be described as beginning with the withdrawal of the Roman legions from Britain in the first years of the fifth century, and continuing until the general spread of Christianity among the Anglo-Saxons in the seventh. During this lapse of time, which covers, roughly speaking, about 200 years, the golden period of the Welsh Church may be definitely fixed as extending from the close of the fifth century to the landing of St. Augustine, and it was during this intervening space of 100 years that the principal Cymric saints flourished. Before, however, endeavouring to give a short account of St. David and his fellow saints out of the vast mass of information, both legendary and historical, at a student's command, it is absolutely necessary that we should sketch a contem-

Digitized by Google

porary picture, however slight and incomplete, of Wales and the Welsh Church, to form, as it were, a background to our subsequent sketches of St. David and the saints of the sixth century.

Although cut off from all intercourse on its eastern or landward side owing to the hostile presence of the pagan Anglo-Saxon settlers, Wales was able, nevertheless, to keep up a constant inter-communication by sea with her Celtic sister-nations of Ireland, Cornwall, Scotland, Strathclyde, and Brittany. For this reason, then, we find that many of the so-called Welsh saints were recruited from Irish, Scotch, or Breton stock; indeed, so plentiful was the supply of missionaries from Brittany alone, that this distant Celtic country was compared by the chronicler Gildas to 'a winter bee-hive that in the pleasant spring-time sends out its principal swarm to gather honey elsewhere.' The Cambro-British Church was therefore compounded partly of old Roman civilization—which was still represented by a certain number of secular priests in the chief centres of population—and partly of a new form of Christianity which was peculiar to Celtic soil; and these two elements, blending together, were able by the close of the sixth century to produce a national Church in Wales which, in spite of all the religious and political changes of 1,300 years, still possesses not a few traces of its double Romano-Celtic origin.

Dismissing at once the tales of chivalry which later generations of writers have ascribed to this dim and distant period, we may state with confidence that the general life of Wales was rude and illiterate, and that such learning, piety, and refinement as still survived in Britannia Secunda were limited exclusively to the great monastic establishments which form the chief feature of early Celtic religious life, and which may in some respects be compared to the large Buddhist communities that are still in existence to-day in Burma.

'The primary local unit in Celtic Christendom was the monastery, not the diocese. The monastery was the centre of missionary enterprise. The titles of bishop and abbot seem to have been somewhat loosely used; and if the records can be trusted, there seem to

Digitized by Google

have been a large number of bishops who were the heads, not of dioceses, but of monastic establishments.'[1]

These houses, partaking equally of the nature of seminary and abbey, served as oases of godliness and culture in a surrounding wilderness of ignorance and brute force. Into these communities, therefore, all persons who desired to lead holy, peaceful or studious lives were thankful to retire, when they had grown to shun or hate their half-pagan and wholly savage surroundings in the outer world. But the inmates of these religious houses were not content to let the years pass by in self-righteous and selfish ease; on the contrary, the various monasteries vied with each other in training and sending out preachers to humanize the rude Cambrian population, which, if the generally accepted accounts be credible, seems to have been Christian merely in name. The method employed was the founding in central situations of small cells—these were in the first instance no more than wooden huts thatched with ferns or rushes—which might serve at once as rallying points to collect a local congregation, and as temporary hermitages for the missionary monks themselves. In course of time some at least of these humble booths would give place to more substantial buildings, to expand later into parish churches with a definite area of influence attached. In all cases the cell or church so established was called by its founder's own name, so that even to this day there exist in all parts of Wales hundreds of such examples, which give to our own generation an undoubted and unbroken link with the remote past.[2] Parishes so developed are easily distinguishable as a rule by the prefix *llan*, a term which includes not only the sacred building itself (the direct descendant of the original founder's hut), but also its adjoining graveyard, and possibly even its glebe-lands, the Welsh word being in fact the exact equivalent of the Greek *τέμενος*, or sacred enclosure. Each place bearing the prefix *llan*, therefore, with a saint's name annexed to it—as in Llandeilo, Llandudno, Llanbadarn, and

[1] Henry Owen, *Gerald the Welshman* (1901).
[2] Rice Rees, Preface to *An Essay on the Welsh Saints.*

Digitized by Google

the like—will at once disclose the fact of an actual foundation by the saint in person whose name it retains; so that in Wales we must be careful to draw a broad line of distinction between these ancient parochial institutions of the early Cambro-British Church, and the various churches, chapels or colleges of post-Norman date, which are dedicated to saints of the Roman calendar.

Among the principal monasteries by whose agency the still-existing parochial system of the principality was thus gradually evolved in the sixth and seventh centuries, we have only space here to allude to the great houses in South Wales founded by the royal saint, Catoc, 'who during the festival of Easter daily fed 100 priests, 100 soldiers, 100 workmen, and 100 beggars, with the same number of widows'; to the famous seminary of St. Illtyd at Llantwit in South Glamorgan; to the monastic establishments of Dubricius (Dyfrig) near the capital city of Caerleon-on-Usk; and of St. David at Menevia, of which last we intend to speak more fully. In North Wales by far the largest and most influential of these peculiarly Celtic institutions was that of Bangor-Iscoed (the high choir in the wood), on the banks of the Dee—founded by Dinooth, and utterly destroyed by the Saxons under Ethelfrith early in the seventh century —where, according to the Venerable Bede, 'such was the number of monks that, when they were divided into seven classes under their respective superintendents, none of these classes contained less than three hundred persons, all of whom supported themselves by their own labour.'[1]

Concerning the universal tendency of the pious and peaceful among all classes of Welsh society to retire into these monasteries, or to found and inhabit outlying cells, one most curious and perhaps unique fact may be noticed: of all those who sought the cloister or the wilderness in order to escape from the outer world of vice and bloodshed, only the names of such as were well-born (and therefore able to contribute more or less liberally to the endowment of the parish then in process of formation) have been handed down to us. In searching through the long roll of 479

[1] Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. cap. 2.

Digitized by Google

Welsh saints whose names and memory are for ever preserved in the parish churches of their own foundation, the student of Cambro-British ecclesiastical history will observe that all these saints are described as being of noble birth, an attribute which is especially noteworthy in a land where historic genealogy has always been highly prized. Nor is the possession of high descent the only feature to be remarked, for on a closer examination of the pedigrees given it will be observed that all, or nearly all, the saints mentioned are so closely inter-related that it would be not unnatural to describe this saintly aristocracy as a clique of three prominent Welsh families, which comprise in themselves the vast majority of the surviving names. These three saint-producing clans are the families descended from Cunedda Wledig (the Illustrious), a prince of pure Cymric descent; of Caw, a Pictish chieftain; and of Brychan, a royal Irish emigrant to Wales. So large a proportion of the total number of acknowledged Welsh saints belongs to these three groups of the 'children' of Cunedda, Caw, and Brychan, that we may reasonably conclude that every member of these three families who founded a cell or entered a monastic house owned an inherent right to saintship. This aspect of the rise and growth of the Cymric Church has been, and still is, the subject of so much controversy among historians and archæologists that, without venturing a private opinion in the matter, we will confine ourselves to quoting Mr. Newell's concise and admirable summing-up of the most probable theory concerning the character and rank borne by the early Welsh saints.

'What, then, are we to say of the four hundred and seventy-nine Welsh saints? Were they all saintly? The answer is to be found in the meaning of the word saint as used in Wales; it practically means 'monk'; the saints were those who left the world, the 'converted' folk who sought the protection of the monasteries. Those who are included in the roll of saints were the monks of noble or gentle birth. This is the secret of the saintly families; the tribal system was the foundation of Welsh life, and it affected ecclesiastical affairs as well as civil. Undoubtedly many men of meaner birth had as good claim to be enrolled in the list on the

Digitized by Google

score of saintliness as many whose names have been entered, but they lacked the requisite of noble birth. Some men are on the list who lived most of their life as worldlings or ruffians, and compensated by a late retirement to some monastery or to a hermitage for the vices of an ill-spent life. . . . But although of the four hundred and seventy-nine saints a large proportion were merely ordinary monks of good birth, there were unquestionably others who in any age would have taken a foremost place for saintliness of life, leaders in the great monastic movement, ascetics who lived lives of rigid austerity and self-discipline, students and scholars, the teachers and illuminators of their native land. These were saints in the strictest sense of the term, these were the men who combated the prevailing wickedness, and conquered by virtue of their faith, not indeed in the way in which the legends pictorially represent them, but no less completely and triumphantly.'[1]

With this brief and necessarily imperfect introduction we will now give such few individual accounts of the Welsh saints themselves as our space will allow. Many illustrious names are of necessity excluded, for we must content ourselves with sketches of St. David and of St. Winifred, who share the honour of being the only two Cymric saints whose names are familiar to English-speaking people; of St. Illtyd, tutor to David; and of Teilo, Deiniol, Asaph and Padarn, the traditional founders of the sees of Llandaff, Bangor, St. Asaph and Llanbadarn. We will first speak of St. Illtyd, as being somewhat earlier in date than his pupil David.

Illtyd Farchog (Iltutus the Knight) was a Breton nobleman, born about the middle of the fifth century, who spent much of his life in the service of the British Court at Caerleon. Finally quitting a life of arms, he retired to found a college at a spot near the Glamorganshire coast, called in his memory Llanilltyd Fawr, better known later Llantwit Major, where he became in course of time—to quote Gildas—'the refined teacher of almost all Britain.' Here at Llantwit (which still possesses some relics of its former sanctity and importance in its ancient crosses and its mediæval buildings) studied David, Paul of Léon, Samson

[1] E. J. Newell, *Diocesan History of Llandaff.*

Digitized by Google

of Dôl, and other holy men, and it was here that Gildas wrote the greater part of his Chronicles. Throughout the saint's lifetime the great house flourished and sent forth missionaries into the wildest parts of South Wales, where Illtyd himself founded many churches, of which thirteen still recall his name.

Illtyd is, however, not only honoured as the tutor of St. David and as the founder of various churches, but in the later Welsh poems, known as the *Triads*, the Abbot of Llantwit is extolled as the inventor of the ploughshare for the benefit both of his own countrymen and of the Irish people. The date of the saint's death is unknown, though his burial-place is traditionally placed near Capel Illtyd in Brecknockshire, at a spot whose local name of Bedd Gwyl Illtyd (the grave of St. Illtyd's Eve), serves to recall the pre-Reformation custom of keeping here the vigil of the saint's festival, which falls on February 7. Of the many legends that centre around this once popular saint, the most interesting bears a striking resemblance to the well-known incident in St. Giles' career, which has been so frequently treated both in mediæval and modern art. While Illtyd was spending some days in solitary prayer at one of his most remote hermitages, it came to pass that a pagan chieftain named Meirchion, whilst out hunting, pursued a hind which fled for safety to the holy man's cell. Here Illtyd, like a Celtic St. Francis of Assisi, at once extended his protection to 'his distressed sister, the hind,' keeping by his saintly powers both dogs and hunters from entering the cell in pursuit of their quarry. At first Meirchion was enraged at this unexpected spoiling of his day's sport, but at last, recognizing the sanctity of the hermit and the will of Heaven in this strange affair, the prince kneeled down before the man of God, and was speedily converted to Christianity. As in St. Giles' beautiful legend, Illtyd's rescued deer is said to have remained with its protector, and even to have drawn the saint's firewood on a little sledge in winter; in fact, the two stories are practically identical, except that in the French version the hind is made to arrive at the saint's cell wounded by an arrow, thereafter the special emblem of St. Giles.

Digitized by Google

The earliest biography we possess of St. David is that of Rhyddmarch, last but one of the British bishops of Menevia, who towards the close of the eleventh century first collected and inscribed the various accounts of the saint's life and miracles which were current in his time. Rhyddmarch's compilation served as the groundwork for the elaborate biographies of the saint written by Giraldus Cambrensis[1] and John of Tynemouth, but, as both these later writings abound in the grossest conceits of their times, it is from Bishop Rhyddmarch's earlier and less extravagant description alone that we can glean any authentic or probable information concerning the patron saint of Wales.

David or Dewi—for the common form of the name was not adopted by the Welsh until comparatively modern times—was born in the wild marshy dingle near Menevia, known as 'the Vale of Roses,'[1] although a very ancient legend fixes the saint's birthplace at a spot some sixty miles north on the Cardiganshire coast known as Hên Fynyw (Old Menevia), where an abundant spring of pure water called David's Well (Pistyll Dewi) is still pointed out by the inhabitants as the scene of his baptism. The saint was the son of Sandde ap Ceredig ap Cunedda, Prince of Ceredigion (the modern Cardiganshire), and of Non, daughter of Gynyr, a high-born maiden whom Sandde met by chance while out hunting and then seduced. The saint was therefore not begotten in wedlock, and though illicit intercourse before marriage has never been judged very severely in Cymric ethics, yet the scandal attaching to David's origin has invariably led his biographers to dwell more upon the magnificence of his lineage than upon the equivocal story of his birth. Of Non, the mother of Dewi, who is said to have subsequently married Prince Sandde, nothing further is recorded, although the fact that she founded four chapels in South Wales all bearing her name, and is ranked as a

[1] See 'Life and Times of Giraldus Cambrensis, Churchman and Historian' (*C. Q. R.*, Jan. 1903).

[2] *Vallis Rosina* is in reality derived from the Welsh *rhos*, a moor, and not from *rosyn*, a rose. Giraldus, with his love of punning, calls the valley 'rosina non rosea,' the Roseless Vale of Roses.

Digitized by Google

saint, leads us to believe that she must have left considerable wealth to the Church.[1] The date of David's birth may be placed with a considerable degree of probability as occurring about the year 500 A.D., and as every tradition assigns a life of unusual length to the saint, we may assume that his death took place some few years before the close of the sixth century, with which St. David's whole career may, broadly speaking, be regarded as contemporaneous.[2] As boy and youth, the saint frequented the colleges of Illtyd at Llantwit and of Paulinus (Paul de Léon) at Whitland,[3] where he soon grew famous for his piety, his learning and his asceticism, but especially for his marvellous powers of preaching.

During the early period of his career, the holy and venerable Dubricius, arch-abbot and bishop of Caerleon, and with him the whole British Church in Wales, were much harassed by the alarming spread of the Pelagian heresy, which (seeing that its author had been the Welsh monk Morgan, or Pelagius, of Bangor) not unnaturally adapted itself with success to the old bardic systems of belief that still lingered in Britain. At an important and largely attended conference (the date of which has been fixed with some degree of accuracy as the year 519 A.D.), held at Brefi on the river Teifi, between the orthodox and the Pelagian clergy, the controversy waxed hot between the spokesmen of either party. But at length Dubricius, who on this occasion was supported by the two missionary bishops from Gaul, Germanus of Auxerre[4] and Lupus of Troyes, finding himself worsted in argument owing to the superior wit and learning of the Pelagian priests, appealed to the many native clergy around him for a champion to refute the adversaries whom he himself

[1] Non's festival is observed on March 3. The churches of Llannon in Carmarthenshire and Llannon in Cardiganshire preserve her name.

[2] The popular myth which credits St. David with a life of 147 years divided into three mystic periods of seven times seven, is, of course, ridiculous.

[3] In Welsh, Ty-Gwyn ar Daf, and in Latin, Alba Domus. This spot, which lies about twenty miles west of Carmarthen, was in later times the site of a Cistercian abbey, founded by Bishop Bernard in 1143.

[4] Six churches in Wales, founded by this Gallic saint, bear his name in Llanarmon, St. Harmon's, Capel Garmon, &c.

Digitized by Google

had failed to convince. Only after much persuasion was the youthful and modest Dewi a last induced by his elders to arise and address the whole assembly, although the effect produced by his eloquent reasoning was immediate.

'When all the fathers assembled enjoined David to preach, he commanded a child which attended him . . . to spread a napkin under his feet, and standing upon it, he began to expound the Gospel and the law to the auditory; all the while that this oration continued, a snow-white dove descending from heaven sate upon his shoulders; and, moreover, the earth on which he stood raised itself under him till it became a hill, from whence his voice like a trumpet was clearly heard, and understood by all, both near and far off.' [1]

From that memorable day the place of this synod became famous as Llandewi-Brefi (David's church at Brefi), and in later times the spot, thus sanctified by the wisdom and eloquence of the patron saint, was occupied by Bishop Bec's wealthy chauntry, which perished at the Reformation. The mysterious adjuncts to David's discourse mentioned above—the rising of the ground, the appearance of a dove, the sound of a trumpet—are obviously tributes to the saint's extraordinary powers of preaching on this occasion, such as may be traced in many a so-called 'legend' of the saints, as, for instance, in the beautiful story of the Tuscan girl-saint, Fina of San Gimignano, where her chronicler's description of the miraculous tolling of all the church bells in her native city can easily be recognized as a fantastic but poetical allusion to the immediate and universal grief felt by all classes of the citizens at the loss of their beloved St. Fina.

Upon this successful display of youthful inspiration, the delighted and awe-struck Dubricius at once nominated the young monk as his successor in the abbey and see of Caerleon, offices which David assumed a few years later on the retirement of Dubricius, who, after the manner of many of the Welsh saints, ended his days in peace and meditation on Bardsey Island (Ynys Enlli), the Lindisfarne of Wales, a rocky islet off the Carnarvonshire coast.

[1] Giraldus Cambrensis, *Life of St. Davia.*

Digitized by Google

'Then they agreed among themselves to praise David, and to acknowledge unanimously that he was a prince over the saints of Britain, saying as follows: "As God has set a governor in the sea over all kinds of fishes, and as God has given a governor on the earth over the birds, so has He given David to be a governor over men in this world; and in the same manner as God gave Matthias in Judæa, and Luke in Alexandria, and James in Jerusalem, and Peter in Rome, and Martin in France, and Samson in Brittany, He has given Saint David in the island of Britain." And therefore Saint David was made a sovereign and prince of the saints in the island of Britain on account of his preaching at this great synod to all the people.'[1]

Apart from his miraculous powers, which were already apparent to all, David was well qualified to hold the position of primate and arch-abbot, for as a grandson of Prince Ceredig he was closely allied to the saintly clan of Cunedda's descendants, and thereby also to several of the ruling Welsh families. His accession to the throne vacated by Dubricius was at once followed by a vigorous and original policy, for David speedily obtained from Prince Arthur, who then reigned at Caerlon and whom Geoffrey of Monmouth names as his nephew, the necessary permission to remove the mother-see from the western capital to the far distant but beloved headland of Menevia. Several reasons seem to have urged the saint to take this singular and momentous step. In the first place David had a natural love of his birth-place, which he ardently wished to distinguish; secondly, he was anxious to withdraw the leading monastic establishment from the neighbourhood of the British Court with its varied influences into the wilderness; thirdly, the nearness of Menevia to the Irish coast, which in clear weather is distinctly visible from St. David's Head, and the consequent opportunities of intercourse with the sister-church of Ireland, were undoubted attractions; while last, but probably far from least, the constant dread of a successful Saxon raid upon Caerleon must have alarmed the saint, whose fears were well grounded, as can be proved by the terrible fate which overtook

[1] W. J. Rees, *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints*

Digitized by Google

the great North Welsh monastery of Bangor-Iscoed, near Chester, shortly after the coming of St. Augustine.

Having once established himself and his devoted monks, now secure alike from royal interference and from the dread of a pagan incursion, in their new home above the wild cliffs of Dyfed, the saint was enabled more easily to impose his rules of conduct upon all who sought a home, whether life-long or temporary, within his monastery. St. David's discipline and method, of which an accurate description has come down to us through Gildas, were certainly severe. The day's work began at cock-crow, and consisted in manual labour on the surrounding farm and garden, wherein 'every member was an ox to himself,' after which the remaining hours of daylight were passed in reading, writing, or meditation, until the sound of the vesper-bell at sunset, when each inmate entered the church to remain there in rapt devotion 'until the appearance of the stars in the sky.' After vespers all met at the common table for supper (apparently the only meal in the twenty-four hours), and were then allowed to rest and refresh themselves 'with plain food and water, though not to excess, for too great a quantity, even of bread, produces luxury.' After supper the fraternity returned to the church for three hours of prayer before retiring to the dormitories. But hard as were the regulations for the monks and lay brethren, the rules drawn up and observed by the bishop-abbot for his own guidance were yet more rigorous.

'As to the father [David], shedding daily abundance of tears, and perfuming the mats with the sacrifice of prayer, and sweet with a double warmth of love and fragrance, he consecrated the appointed oblation of Our Lord's Body with clean hands, and so after morning prayers went alone to hear angelic discourse. Also he sought cold water at some distance, where, by remaining long therein, and becoming frozen, he might subdue the heat of the flesh. Then he passed the whole day unmoveable and unwearied in teaching, praying, kneeling, and taking care of the brethren, and of the orphans and widows, and of the needy and feeble and infirm, and of strangers, and in feeding the multitude. So he began, so he performed, and so he finished. And the rest of his vigorous discipline, although proper to be imitated, the shortness of this account prevents

Digitized by Google

us from mentioning; but he imitated the Egyptian monks, and led a life like to them.'[1]

This cenobitic life in his extreme westerly retreat was, however, often varied by visitations of the different parts of his vast diocese, and also by occasional voyages to Ireland and Cornwall, where David founded churches.[2] His devoted disciples, Teilo and Padarn, whose lives will presently be discussed, were his inseparable companions in all these wanderings, so that in the verses of the *Triads*, David, Teilo, and Padarn are described as 'the Three Blessed Visitors of Britain, who went about the country preaching the faith in Christ without pay or reward to all ranks of people.' It would be idle to enumerate or even to allude to the numberless miracles and acts attributed to the saint during his episcopal career by Giraldus Cambrensis, by Geoffrey of Monmouth, and other monkish authors; but amid all the mass of legend and of pure fiction, one authentic fact, that of a synod held at Caerleon in or about the year 565 A.D., stands out clearly. The name of 'Synod of Victory' given to this meeting, over which St. David, as leading bishop and abbot of South Wales, undoubtedly presided, proves it to have been an assembly of special importance, at which, according to some writers, the lingering taint of the Pelagian heresy was finally eradicated, or else, to follow the arguments of recent critics, St. David's new rules for the discipline of the British clergy were brought forward and adopted.

The date of the saint's death is unknown, but, on our previous supposition that he was born about the year 500 A.D., it could hardly have occurred later than 590 A.D. According to the popular legend, David was privileged to receive a Divine warning of his impending death, which took place on March 1, on which day, after performing Mass in the presence of his weeping monks and of the grief-stricken people of the neighbourhood,[3] St. David retired to his cell, and there peacefully expired. And so he was buried in his cathedral church

[1] W. J. Rees, *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints.*

[2] Four churches, Thelbridge, Ashprington, Dewstowe or Davidstow, and St. David's, Exeter, are dedicated to the Welsh patron saint.

[3] Still called in the saint's memory 'Dewisland.'

Digitized by Google

at Menevia, where his relics remained until the sack and total destruction of St. David's by Danish pirates in the tenth century, after which a convenient legend—somewhat similar to the Venetian theory of the recovery of St. Mark's body after the complete destruction by fire of San Marco itself—was invented, to announce the miraculous preservation of the saint's corpse, which was once more encased amid public rejoicing in a richly decorated shrine in the new church.

Undoubtedly great as were the reputation and popularity enjoyed by David during his long life, his posthumous fame tended to grow still wider and brighter throughout the whole of Wales. Although during life the saint's labours had in Britain itself been confined almost solely to South Wales,[1] where no less than fifty-three churches and chapels of his own foundation still recall his name, St. David had by the time of the Norman Conquest come to be regarded as the leading Cambro-British saint, and as such was canonized in 1120 A.D. by Pope Calixtus II., a step that was taken at the instance of King Henry I., who hoped by so marked an honour to the Welsh national saint to appease the general discontent in Wales caused by Anselm's recent policy of nominating Norman churchmen to Cymric sees.

'It has been observed that the reputation which St. David has acquired of being the patron saint of Wales is of modern introduction, and the observation is certainly true in the sense of the words "tutelar saint," as understood by those who compiled the romances of the Seven Champions of Christendom. It may also be said that the story of the leek and its adoption as a national emblem is not noticed by his early biographers. But these remarks should not be made with a view to disparage his memory. He has long maintained the highest station among the saints of his country; and whether the number of churches attributed to him, or his exertions in the overthrow of Pelagianism be considered, he possesses the fairest claim to such a distinction. Since the twelfth century his eminence

[1] It is curious to note that not a single church of early foundation in North Wales bears David's name, from which fact we may reasonably infer that in Wales itself the saint never penetrated north of the middle region of Powys.

Digitized by Google

has been undisputed, and the poem of Gwynfardd, written in that age, lauds him in terms as if he were second only to the Almighty.'[1]

The fame and sanctity of David's shrine at Menevia —henceforth known as Ty Dewi (David's abode) or St. David's—gradually extended beyond Wales into England, so that by the close of the eleventh century the spot had become a popular place of pilgrimage, to which were attached spiritual rewards of such value that two visits to this wild and remote headland came to be accounted as equal to a single journey to Rome itself, a theory which is summed up in the quaint hexameter:

'Roma semel quantum, bis dat Menevia tantum.'

Both William the Conqueror and the powerful Henry II. considered St. David's shrine of sufficient importance to warrant a special visit, while in November 1284, Edward I., in company with Queen Eleanor, did not fail to approach and enrich the sanctuary of the patron saint of the conquered race, whose last prince had been overthrown and slain by the English arms two years before. But during the stormy changes at the Reformation the shrine perished, and its votive gifts were scattered, after which the removal of the bishop's residence to Abergwilly so reduced the ancient importance of St. David's that finally the lonely but famous city sank into the humble village of our own times. Under such circumstances it is not strange to find that the memory of David among his countrymen grew faint and indistinct, though owing to his position of acknowledged patron saint his name, almost alone of all the early Welsh saints, has ever remained prominent and familiar in his native land.

Since the ecclesiastical revival of last century numerous modern churches in the Principality have been dedicated to St. David, but we cannot at this moment recall any representation of the saint either in carving or painting. It is, however, worth noticing that the patron saint of Wales, like his royal Jewish namesake, can be made to assume two distinct characters in sacred art. As the youthful and fervent,

[1] Rice Rees, *Essay on the Welsh Saints.*

Digitized by Google

yet modest, victor of the Pelagian heretics, St. David should be represented as a young monk in the attitude of preaching, with his feet planted on the green hillock of Brefi, and with the dove of Divine eloquence fluttering near his lips; while, as first Bishop of Saint David's and as sage counsellor, he should be made to appear as a venerable prelate clothed in the full vestments of an archbishop.

Saint Teilo, who ranks second in importance among the South Welsh saints, was himself a great-grandson of Cunedda the Illustrious, and therefore cousin to David. As one of the 'Three Blessed Visitors,' Teilo in his youth often accompanied David on his missionary travels, and according to an ancient but most improbable tradition, undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, where the three Cambro-British saints, David, Teilo, and Padarn, were all consecrated bishops by the patriarch of Jerusalem. As abbot of Llandaff, originally a daughter-house to the arch-monastery of Caerleon, Teilo is usually accounted founder and first bishop or archbishop of the present see of Llandaff, to which he was consecrated by St. David, with the assistance of the two Gallic bishops, Germanus and Lupus.

'Llandaff, from the pre-eminence of Teilo among the disciples of Dubricius, and perhaps also from the patronage of the royal house of Morganwg, became now the "arch-monastery," and its episcopal abbot the "archbishop." . . . The claims both of the bishops of St. David's and of the bishops of Llandaff to the title of archbishop were justifiable (for St. David's also was an arch-monastery), but only so long as they retained their daughter-monasteries in subordination. When the episcopate became diocesan, the reason for the title expired, and in the twelfth century it was an anachronism.'[1]

The 'Teilo churches,' as the personal foundations of this saint are designated, are said to have been nearly forty in number, of which eighteen survive, while of these eighteen no fewer than ten preserve their founder's memory in the name of Llandeilo. Beyond this fact but little that can be accounted authentic is known of Teilo, although a long legendary Life of the saint is included in the celebrated *Book of Llandaff*, the work of a twelfth-century compiler (stated on

[1] E. J. Newell, *Diocesan History of Llandaff.*

Digitized by Google

good authority to have been the monk Galfrith, brother to Urban, first Norman bishop of Llandaff), which happily escaped the wholesale plunder of the cathedral treasury at the time of the Reformation. From the pages of this valuable transcript of early Cymric tradition we learn that Teilo, perhaps in company with St. Padarn, left Wales at the time of the yellow plague (Y Fâd felen) to seek a temporary refuge in Brittany with St. Samson, bishop of Dôl, and that after some years he returned to Llandaff, where he died. The saint's birthplace is named as Penally, near Tenby, but the dates of both his birth and death are unknown, though we may assume he was born early in the sixth century and, as all accounts credit him with great age, that he died about the same year as St. David, who was slightly his senior. Teilo, whose anniversary is held on February 9, has in recent years been chosen as the patron saint of certain newly built churches in Glamorganshire, so that his long-forgotten name has once more grown tolerably familiar to the people of Wales. One curious circumstance in connexion with him is perhaps worth recording here. In an old farmhouse near the chapelry of Llandeilo, which lies in the wild district of the Preselley Mountains in Pembrokeshire, a time-honoured relic of Teilo is still preserved in the so-called skull of the saint, which was until late years used by the local peasantry in cases of illness on account of its supposed healing powers; much as the image of the 'Santissimo Bambino' of the Church of Ara Coeli was—and is still—carried to sick beds in Rome. The existence after so many centuries of this relic, and the continued belief in its miraculous properties (especially in so strictly Nonconformist a district) are of no little historical interest, since they are doubtless connected with one of the most popular of the Teilo legends, which relates that after his death three different places—Llandaff, Llandeilo-Fawr in Carmarthenshire, and Penally, which is not far distant from the Preselley Range—each claimed the ownership of the saint's corpse. The dispute seemed incapable of a settlement, 'when, by a miracle, three bodies appeared in the room of one, so like that the real one could not be distinguished. It was there-

Digitized by Google

fore agreed to bury one body at each of the three places, trusting to the chance which of them might be the identical corpse of the saint.'[1]

In addition, it may be noted here that Teilo's brother Mabon (commemorated in the name of Llanfabon, near Llandaff) is also ranked among the Welsh saints; while his half-brother, St. Afan of Builth, became the third bishop of Llanbadarn, and the founder of two churches—one in Cardiganshire and the other in Brecknockshire—the latter of which, Llanafan-fawr, still contains his memorial gravestone, with the inscription 'Hic jacet Aveanus Episcopus.'

Padarn, or Paternus, the third of the 'Three Blessed Visitors,' was an Armorican of noble birth, who came to Wales about the time of the synod of Llandewi-Brefi, in order to study at Illtyd's college of Llantwit. As we have already stated, Padarn became a disciple and close friend of St. David, under whose auspices he founded the see of Llanbadarn—comprising North Cardiganshire and Radnorshire—at a spot formerly known as Mauritania, about a mile inland from the modern watering-place of Aberystwyth. Besides his cathedral church at Llanbadarn-Fawr (whose site is now occupied by a massive twelfth-century building), Padarn founded at least five other churches, all of them recalling his name, in the counties of Cardigan and Radnor. According to the Welsh chronicler Sulgenus, son of Sulien, Bishop of St. David's in the eleventh century, Padarn ruled his newly established see for twenty-one years, spending his days in spiritual exercises similar to those enjoined and practised by his master, Dewi—*orans*, *jejunans*, *vigilans*, *lachrymansque*, *gemensque*. By the same authority he is also said to have rebuked the powerful Maelgwyn Gwynedd, over-lord of Wales, for acts of violence and injustice; but otherwise no incident of historical value during the saint's Welsh career has been recorded. For unexplained reasons Padarn finally returned to his native Brittany, where he became Bishop of Vannes, in which capacity he subscribed to the decrees of the Council of Paris in 557 A.D. The saint 'is commended both as an abbot and a bishop in the

[1] Rice Rees, *An Essay on the Welsh Saints.*

Digitized by Google

writings of Venantius Fortunatus, a Latin poet of Gaul, who was his contemporary,' but neither the date nor place of his death are known; although April 15 has been traditionally observed as his festival. The Welsh see founded by Padarn, and bearing his name, continued to flourish until the eighth century, when in circumstances which are very obscure it became merged in the mother diocese of St. David's.

We will now turn to an important saintly house of North Wales which, in the words of the poet Gwynfardd, was 'highly exalted, and unequalled for lineage, morality and courtesy.' This family includes the names of Dunawd, or Dinooth, founder of the ill-fated monastery of Bangor-Iscoed, which has been already mentioned; of his three sons, Deiniol, Gwarthan and Cynwyl, or Conwil—founder of the churches of Conwil-Caio and Conwil-Elvet, in Carmarthenshire; and of his grandson, Deiniol ap Deiniol, or Deiniolen, reputed second Bishop of Bangor. Of Dinooth's three sons Deiniol for several years aided his father in ruling the immense community of Bangor-Iscoed, but finally repaired to the Menai Straits, where he established a college known as Bangor Deiniol, to distinguish it from the parent house. Here Deiniol resided for many years, combining the practices of a hermit with the rule of an abbot, until the middle of the sixth century, when the tyrannical Prince Maelgwyn, 'growing virtuous in his old age, and making a sacrifice to God of the devil's leavings, converted the college of Bangor into a bishopric, and appointed Deiniol to be its first bishop.'[1] Beyond the fact that Prince Maelgwyn was Deiniol's acknowledged patron and benefactor, little else is known of this important saint, concerning whose life and acts the later legendary writers are almost silent. He is said to have attended the synod of Llandewi-Brefi, presumably in his youth; to have gained no little fame as a musician and poet; and, like most of the North Welsh saints, to have retired finally to the Isle of Bardsey, in whose sacred soil he lies buried. In the verses of the *Triads*, Deiniol is celebrated by later bards as one of the 'Three Holy Bachelors of Britain,' in company with St. Catoc and St. Madog, though this

[1] Thomas Pennant, *A Tour in Wales.*

Digitized by Google

description hardly tallies with the generally accepted belief that he was the father of Deiniolen, his successor in the see of Bangor.

Of St. Asaph, from whom the second North Welsh see derives its present name, we are vaguely informed by Giraldus Cambrensis that 'he was more especially illustrious for his descent and form, and from his childhood shone brightly both with virtues and miracles, daily endeavouring to imitate his master in all sanctity and abstinence.'[1] Asaph's master was no other than the celebrated Scottish saint, known variously as Kentigern, Mungo, and Cynderyn, who, being forced to quit his see of Glasgow about the middle of the sixth century, settled in North Wales and founded a small college on the banks of the river Elwy, where Asaph became his favourite out of many pupils. Winning over the powerful Maelgwyn to his own interests, St. Kentigern finally persuaded that prince to raise this new foundation to the rank of a bishopric, which from its site was called Llanelwy, a name still in use amongst Welsh-speaking folk. Returning to his native Glasgow about the year 560 A.D., Kentigern nominated his beloved pupil and companion, Asaph, as his successor in the vacant see of Llanelwy, which henceforth became known as St. Asaph out of compliment to its second bishop, who died towards the close of the sixth century.

To North Wales also belongs the last saint whose life we shall attempt to describe in this article: Winifred (in Welsh Brenna or Gwenfrwi), whose story belongs perhaps more to English than to Cymric hagiology, since her cult and reputation are of much later growth. According to her legend, as related by Cressy, Winifred was a damsel of noble birth and niece of the holy St. Beuno, the founder of ten churches under the patronage of Prince Cadfan. Despising marriage and all worldly cares and pleasures, Winifred, under a vow of perpetual virginity, lived a life of solitude and devotion in the midst of a forest. Here she was one day surprised by a young chieftain of the neighbourhood, Caradoc ap Alan, who, smitten with her beauty, at once

[1] Giraldus Cambrensis, *Itinerarium Kambriae.*

Digitized by Google

endeavoured to force her chastity. The terrified maiden, however, managed to escape, but was pursued and finally overtaken by Caradoc at the threshold of St. Beuno's cell in the vale of Sychnant (Drybrook). Here the prince, mad with revenge and with baulked desire, brutally slew St. Winifred by cutting off her head with his sword, and then departed before the return of Beuno and his companions, by whom the murder was discovered. The grief-stricken hermit, kneeling down by his niece's corpse, then piously joined the severed head to the bleeding trunk,

'whereupon the virgin presently rose up, as if from sleep, cleansing her face from the dust and sweat, and filled the congregation with wonder and joy. Now in the place where the head was rejoined to the body there appeared a white circle compassing the neck, small as a white thread, which continued so all her life, showing the place where the section had been made. And the report in that country (Wales) is that from this white circle she had the name of Winifred given her, whereas at first she had been called Brenna; for in the British language *win* signifies white.'

But Winifred's restoration to life was by no means the only miracle performed on this occasion, for on the very spot where the maiden's head had fallen to earth, there now gushed forth a plenteous spring in the dry barren soil of Sychnant—a circumstance which will at once recall a similar legend concerning St. Paul's execution outside the Ostian Gate of Rome, at the place afterwards known in consequence as the Three Fountains. From this date onward Winifred shared her uncle's cell and ministered to his wants until he died, while reports of her wonderful restoration to life, of her many virtues, and of the healing properties of her miraculous fountain, won the maiden saint much fame during her lifetime which lasted fifteen years after her decapitation. Like Deborah of old, Winifred was often consulted on questions of national importance, and the intense love of truth shown in her judgements gained her the local epithet of 'The Candid Winifred.' In spite, however, of the alleged powers and popularity of Winifred and her well in early times, it is curious and instructive to note that in the survey of Flintshire recorded by Domesday Book no mention

Digitized by Google

whatever is made of church, chapel, or well belonging to this saint, so that it is not unnatural to conclude that her elaborate biography is almost wholly an invention of post-Norman times, put forward to account for the undoubted medical value of the waters at Holywell that bear her name. In the Middle Ages these waters were frequently used with good results in cases of rheumatism and skin eruptions—the two ills from which humanity mostly suffered during a period of utter ignorance of hygiene and medicine—so that the neighbouring abbey of Basingwerk was enabled to reap no small gains out of the fees of visitors to St. Winifred's Well. So great grew the reputation of the spring and its tutelar saint, that a special guild was formed at Shrewsbury, having for a device on its seals and banners the representation of Winifred's martyrdom—a crowned and bearded savage in the act of beheading a beautiful virgin.

So deep-rooted and widespread was the public belief in these sacred and beneficent waters, that the new laws and new ideas of the Reformation quite failed to arrest the popular habit of resorting to this spot, which is probably the only shrine in Great Britain that has been continuously sought by the sick and the pious from the early ages of Christianity down to the present day. In August 1686, James II., while the guest of the notorious Bishop Cartwright at Chester, paid a special visit—the last royal pilgrimage on British soil—with a numerous train to Holywell, where the king gave memorial rings to certain Roman Catholic gentlemen of the place, and was himself solemnly presented by a local Welsh squire with the blood-stained shift of his great-grandmother, Mary, Queen of Scots. Thomas Pennant, writing in the latter half of the eighteenth century, notes the declining but still considerable vogue of the well during his visit to Flintshire:

'The resort of pilgrims of late years to these Fontanalia has considerably decreased; the greatest number are from Lancashire. In the summer still a few are to be seen in the water in deep devotion up to their chins for hours, sending up their prayers, or performing a number of evolutions round the polygonal well, or threading the

Digitized by Google

arch between well and well a prescribed number of times. Few people of rank at present honour the fountain with their presence, and the majority of these are of the fair sex. . . . The spring is certainly one of the finest in the kingdom, and by the two different trials and calculations, lately made for my information, is found to fling out about twenty-one tons of water in a minute. It never freezes; and scarcely varies in the quantity of water in droughts or after the greatest rains.'[1]

The same writer also mentions the two rose-coloured fragrant mosses covering the stones round the well, which the popular myth of Winifred ascribed to the stains of the saint's blood, and credited with curative powers. Pennant, after examination, pronounced them to be a *jungermannia* and a *byssus*, mosses which are noted by Linnæus as being of some value in cases of eczema. Of the recently revived popularity of the well, and of the efforts made by certain well-meaning Roman Catholics to transform it into a Welsh imitation of Lourdes, it is unnecessary to speak in these pages.

We may complete our account of St. Winifred with a few remarks on the obscure nature of the position and the obligations of female saints in the early Cambro-British Church. It is remarkable how comparatively few holy women (and those chiefly connected with the Irish house of Brychan) are included in the long list of nearly five hundred Welsh saints; while it is fairly certain that there were no regular nunneries existing in Wales at this period. Many of the recognized female saints, who were founders of churches and in whose memory festivals were kept, are described as having been the wives or mothers of princes or of holy men; nor have we any reason to assume that in their widowhood they gave up a life of secular occupation. The principle of taking vows of life-long chastity, which is of Gallican and not of British origin, was undoubtedly introduced into Wales by St. Germanus, who, as we know, prior to his departure for our island, himself gave the veil to the fourteen-year old Geneviève, afterwards patron saint of the city of Paris, at her earnest request. But whatever the causes may have been,

[1] Thomas Pennant, *A Tour in Wales.*

Digitized by Google

this imported custom of female celibacy never became popular in Wales, and St. Winifred remains one of the few Cymric saints who, according to tradition, definitely made an early sacrifice of her virginity to the service of God.

In conclusion, we are fully aware how lightly and imperfectly we have in these pages touched upon our subject. It is one of equal value and interest to the historian and to the hagiologist, since a study of the Cambro-British saints not only discloses a large number of gracious personalities and characteristic legends, but also throws a strong light on the dark ages of Welsh history, so that we can understand more clearly the primitive society of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. To those who are anxious to hear more of the founders of the Welsh Church, and thereby to study the earlier annals of Wales itself, we recommend the reading of the opening chapters in the diocesan histories of the four Welsh sees, to be followed later by a perusal of Rice Rees' *Essay on the Welsh Saints*, an exhaustive and brilliantly written treatise, which, ever since its appearance nearly seventy years ago, has been accounted the classic work on the hagiology, and consequently on the early ecclesiastical history, of Wales.

HERBERT M. VAUGHAN.

Digitized by Google

ART. III.—WILLIAM ARCHER BUTLER.

1. *Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical.* By the Rev. W. ARCHER BUTLER, M.A. Edited, with a Memoir of the Author's Life, by the Revs. T. WOODWARD, M.A., and J. A. JEREMIE, D.D. Tenth Edition. 2 vols. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1882.)
2. *Letters on the Development of Christian Doctrine in Reply to J. H. Newman's Essay.* By the Rev. W. A. BUTLER. Edited by Rev. T. WOODWARD, M.A. (Dublin, 1850.)
3. *Lectures on the History of Ancient Philosophy.* By Professor W. A. BUTLER. Edited by W. H. THOMPSON, M.A. 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1856.) Second edition, 1 vol. (1875).
4. *Private and Unpublished Letters and Papers.*

THE interest in the fortunes of Trinity College, Dublin, which has been excited by the Report of the Royal Commission and the ill-advised attempts of the present Government to solve the problem of Irish University education by methods which are generally condemned by educational authorities, and unacceptable to the majority of the Irish people,[1] makes it not inappropriate to recall to the minds of our readers the memory of one whom his college accounts among the most distinguished of her teachers, and who is still remembered as one of the greatest preachers in the Church of Ireland.

William Archer Butler was the first Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin, and his lectures, published after his death, amply testify to his philosophical powers. He was also a graceful poet, whose poems, many of which exist only in manuscript, might well deserve to be rescued from oblivion. As a controversialist he was the worthy opponent of Cardinal Newman, among the many answers to whose *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* Butler's was considered by so good a judge as Bishop Thirlwall to be the best. But it is

[1] *Cf.* 'Irish University Education and the Reform of Trinity College, Dublin,' *C.Q.R.* Oct. 1906.

Digitized by Google

as a preacher that he is best remembered. His sermons, written for the most part before he was thirty years of age, and published, unrevised, after his death, have passed through no less than ten editions, and are to this day widely known and valued. A very brief and meagre memoir was prefixed by Dean Woodward to the first volume of them. It consists largely of extracts from his youthful speeches and poems, and the strictly biographical matter in it could be condensed into a few pages. This it is our intention to supplement in the present article by the aid of his letters, journals, and manuscript poems which have come into our hands.

William Archer Butler was born at Annerville, near the town of Clonmel, Co. Tipperary, about the end of 1812 or beginning of 1813. There exists no record of the date of his birth, but in a brief journal written in 1832 he states he was then 'about twenty years of age.'[1] His father, Pierce Archer Butler, was a member of the Established Church; but through the influence of his mother, who was a Roman Catholic, he and his six brothers and sisters were all brought up in that communion. The father seems from the very first to have been struck with the talents of William, who was his second son.

'As soon as he could speak,' we are told, 'William was made to recite Shakespeare and by degrees the speeches of modern orators, with appropriate gestures, and even when he was four or five years old taught to be very distinct in pronunciation. At the age of nine he was sent to the Endowed School in Clonmel, where special attention was paid to oratory and he was encouraged to think over and invent speeches for their exhibitions.'

He was a dreamy child, loving solitude, and delighting in the beautiful scenery around his uncle's place, Garnavilla, which was situated on the bank of the Suir and near the Galtee mountains. He took no part in the games of his schoolfellows, who probably did not understand his tastes and pursuits, so that he thought himself shunned by them;

[1] This will justify us in setting back Prof. Dowden's date (1814?) in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* s.v. by at least a year.

Digitized by Google

nevertheless, we are told, he was universally popular on account of his amiability and playful wit. He was thus one of those *spiritual* characters who ever and anon appear among men. One who was much conversant with the manhood of America in the time of the Civil War tells us how in camp or hospital he sometimes met with

'specimens of unworldliness, disinterestedness, and animal purity and heroism—perhaps some unconscious Indianian or from Ohio or Tennessee, on whose birth the calmness of heaven seems to have descended and whose gradual growing up . . . the power of a strange spiritual sweetness, fibre, and inward health have also attended. Something veiled or abstracted is often a part of the manners of these beings . . . their companions only understanding that they are different from the rest, more silent, "something odd about them," and apt to go off and muse and meditate in solitude.' [1]

Archer Butler spent his leisure hours in reading poetry and philosophy, and before he left school the precocious boy was an ardent admirer of the writings of Francis Bacon, and had not only studied the works of many of the chief Scotch metaphysicians but had plunged for himself into the problems of Being, and found that the study of philosophy was his best loved pursuit. He ranged abroad also over the wide fields of literature, so that in after years we find him lamenting the possession of 'that mortal foe to steady determination, a boundlessly romantic spirit, fostered by the thousand volumes of ruinous lore which my younger days have fed on.' From his earliest years he was deeply religious, and his moral feelings extraordinarily sensitive. He was also conscientious in observing all the requirements of his religion; [2] but we are informed that on one occasion when he attended confession, feeling his spirit burdened with a sense of sinfulness, and hoping to find

[1] Walt Whitman, *Specimen Days in America.*

[2] 'For long hours of the night he would lie prostrate on the ground, filled with remorse for offences which would not for one moment have disturbed the self-complacency of even well-conducted youths' (Woodward).

Digitized by Google

relief, his confessor was unsympathizing and treated these secrets of his soul as if they were morbid imaginations, and threw all his poignant emotions back upon himself. The moral nature of the earnest youth received a shock, and from that time he began to inquire and to examine the grounds of his faith, with the result that before long he passed from Roman Catholicism and became a faithful son of the Church of Ireland. His four sisters subsequently followed him, the other brothers remained in the Roman communion; but the diversity of their religious opinions did not interfere with the warm attachment which existed always between the members of the family.

In 1829 Butler entered Trinity College, Dublin. He pursued the same plan of wide but desultory studies as before, and studied classics for their contents rather than as a grammarian or philologist. He was elected to a Classical Scholarship, however, in 1832; among his fellow scholars that year were Isaac Butt, the son of a Donegal clergyman, and Charles Graves, afterwards Bishop of Limerick. Woodward testifies that his fellow students felt that Archer Butler possessed a master mind, which could charm by the playfulness of its fancy while it astonished by the vastness of its intellectual resources. He was at once recognized as possessing great rhetorical powers, and his magnificent address delivered in 1834 at the opening of the session of the College Historical Society, of which he was auditor that year, was never forgotten by those who heard it.

His chief joy during the eight years he resided in college seems to have been writing reviews, essays, and poems for the *Dublin University Magazine* and for *Blackwood's*. Every year he won a prize in the University for a poetic or prose composition. His essays in the reviews were highly thought of at the time, and among them a sympathetic article on Goldsmith and two articles on Bishop Berkeley are good examples of his happy style.[1]

He possessed in a high degree the poetical temperament, and delighted to pour out his feelings in verse. In his *Remembrances of a Poetical Childhood* he describes his

[1] *Dublin University Magazine*, April and May 1836.

Digitized by Google

eagerness in the acquisition of knowledge, his disgust at the criminal records of history, and his upward progress through philosophy to religion.

'Thus summers passed; and radiant knowledge broke
Apace upon my kindled soul . . .
Then swelled the unfolding energies, then rose
The mental arm of stronger grasp—the doom
Of deeper glance and more despairing woes
That filled the poet's history. . . .

'Books and the teeming wonders of the earth
Surcharged my soul with thought, from cloud to wave
Nature was big with miracles—her mirth
Gleamed in the laughing sky; the tempest's rave [*sic*]
Uttered the mighty music of her wrath.
At night she murmured peace and mystic dreams
When, bending from her star-inwoven path,
She slow undrew the curtained web of beams
That hides her field of lustrous worlds from day;
All this I felt, yet *how* my lips would feebly say.

'And lettered wisdom too, transfusing thought
From soul to soul, gave comments to these scenes,
Enlarged the bounds of Reason's realm and brought
A thousand minds to one. Thus Art convenes
Her council of the great of perished ages
In living hearts, and quickens buried truth
To life immortal on her pictured pages.
These gave the lore of manhood to my youth,
These spread my soul abroad through every clime,
And multiplied my life the tenant of all time.

'I read of mightiest empires, gorgeous kings
The fierce, the fallen! I traced the awful course—
—As some majestic river's wanderings,
Calm to the eye but torrent-strong in force—
Of that Arch-Ruler's will enthroned on Fate,
Which moulds the chaos of our deeds to good.
From age to age, from scene to scene, elate
Sprung the untiring soul, and keenly viewed
The varied man—alas! 'twas varied vice,
I loathed the dark detail that chilled my heart to ice.

Digitized by Google

'The volume dropped. I fled the tale of man,
And sank in dim abstractions, shapes of air
Invoked by mild Philosophy. I ran
Through sects and systems,—taught my soul to dare
Question herself and in her secret shrine
Explore the mystery of her being's aim,
The wherefore of her nature and design.
Dim the response; but light celestial came
Whence only it hath ever come. I trod
With fearful steps and slow the temple-court of God.
And now the glory of supernal grace
Flooded my soul with wonder.'

Butler's poems in the opinion of a great living critic (Dr. Dowden) give an impression of the affluence of his mind, and he considers even the least excellent of them to possess value as the outpourings of a very elevated heart and brain.

A brief journal, begun in 1832, and continuing only for a period of six months, shews us that, though Butler was outwardly living so full a life, the subject of religion held a foremost place in his heart. It displays the deep humility and self-depreciation so commonly seen in the 'confessions' of holy men. In his sermon on 'Self-Delusion' he speaks on this subject.

'Were a perfect man to exist, he himself would be the last to know it, for the highest stage of advancement is the lowest descent of humility. As long as this humility is necessary to the fulness of the Christian character, it would seem to be of the essence of constant growth in grace to see itself lowlier as God exalts it higher!'

'Thus,' he adds, 'the spirit of man as it becomes relatively more perfect may be said to feel itself absolutely less so.'[1]

'Saturday, August 25, 1832.—There are various snares for various minds. The perusal of the works of those philosophic Christians who tread on the brink of infidelity, and love to bid their readers stoop over the giddy precipice is one to me, unsettling my mind as much as, if not more than, treatises of professed impiety. Formal arguments we may gird our minds resolutely to examine and resist, but the undefined impression

[1] *Sermons* (1849), p. 144.

Digitized by Google

produced by books of pleasing fiction, &c., which present views of the world unconnected with a presiding Spirit and redeeming Saviour, lulls our apprehensions to sleep and poisons slowly.

'Sunday, August 26.—Alas! "it shone no Sabbath day for me," if the Sabbath be measured by the feelings which should attend it. In the attendance on public worship I gained as little advantage as usual. I do not know whether I am singular in finding this attendance only a snare of vanity. It is a fine thought indeed that all the Christian world are at the same moment engaged in offering up supplication to their common Master; but the crowd produces a wandering of thought—a difficulty in concentrating its attention on its mighty task—a seeking for the suffrages of my fellow-men rather than for the ear of God.'

'Saturday, September 15.—Very feeble and depressed do I experience my spirit this day, and for some preceding ones. The man who contends with the world may be perpetually reminded of Virgil's comparison of the rower in a rapid current; he must never sleep, for his adversary never sleeps; a moment of exhaustion may dissolve the labour of days, and thus, with occasional desires for the better country, my spiritual system bends under the force of, not direct assaults, but undermining impressions. I am the denizen of a family circle in which, from morn till eve, religion never seems to appear. Thus a weak mind like mine perpetually forgets its higher birth, and, as many others, I am disgusted with the frivolity of those around me, yet become a participator in their criminal indolence. Am I after all to be one of the thousand, one of the fluttering dreamers? Horrible thought! no interest in Christ—no anchorage in Heaven—no adoption from the Father. Hatred for earth and no love for Heaven! Oh! is there in nature a more contemptible character than mine, an indolent fastidious thing, that cannot but despise the nothingness of this life's practices, yet is utterly unable to pursue the plain course of happiness; an embodying of that emphatic phrase, "Video meliora, proboque, deteriora sequor?"'

His commonplace book, which belongs to this time of his life, is full of extracts from many and various authors in different languages, and on many subjects both literary and scientific. It is interspersed with frequent thoughts of his own, and scattered here and there on its pages are to be found condensed pregnant fragments of thought to which

Digitized by Google

he gives the name of 'Laconics.' They illustrate both the originality of his thoughts and his power to give them striking expression:

'The English people, like a bridge, grow stronger the more that is laid upon them.'

'Toryism, the Calvinism of politics, builds ultimately its philosophy upon the deep corruption of human nature as its main theoretical principle; Whiggery, the Arminianism of politics, upon the loftiness and perfectibility of that nature. Hence the young (who imagine they can reach and reform everything) tend to the latter; the old and experienced (who have felt that a secret obstacle of depravity resists everything) to the former.'

'History is the detail of the Past, illumined by the experience of the Present, and directed to anticipate the Future.'

'No extravagance so often wears the garb of a virtue as mistaken resolution. Some men act not because they *now* think action their duty, but because they once thought so. They are in resolution what the famous astrologer was in prediction—who prophesied his own death on a certain day and then hanged himself to fulfil his prophecy. Is it not absurd that a man should argue, "I ought to act thus because I promised to do so," and not rather "I promise myself to act thus because I ought to do so," to make duty depend on determination, not determination on duty?'

'There is no personal identity in parties. Hence never be influenced by the promises of a party. They may be sincere at the moment, but next year they are actually not the same party who made the promise. This may be very dishonest, but it is very true; they are actually not conscious of their own falsehood; they have no preservation of consciousness, no continued identity!'

'Solitude improves great and injures little minds.'

'Love's deadliest enemy is to have none to overthrow.'

'There is a strong love of existence and a doubting hope nourished almost involuntarily in the mind which I am persuaded render the prospect of annihilation to the unbeliever more intolerable than the probability of misery and the dim possibility of happiness.'

'The great religious use of solitude flows from the natural hostility of man to that state, however paradoxical it may seem. For the mind when in solitude feels the want of beings on which

Digitized by Google

to exhaust its affections—it seeks something to love. But not possessing these beings in reality, it is driven to an ideal world, and centres its hopes and love and the fond fulness of its communion upon the Great Being whom we adore in the secrecy of the heart! This is true, for it is my own experience.'

'The faculty of a poetic imagination is only a pure, refined, and acute vision, a sight which sees more than the vulgar eye can recognise.'

'All Christ's miracles are of mercy; nearly the very first of the apostles' a miracle of judgment.'

'The mind possesses little of that power so strikingly possessed by the body, of resisting the influence of temperature, of remaining unchanged, though surrounded by enormous heat and cold.'

'Much of the overweening admiration and recommendation of special bodily austerities in the early Church arose, doubtless, from the frequency of the contemplative life. For there, the opportunities of actual worldly discipline being few, it seemed (and really was to a great degree) necessary to devise studied modes of self-conquest. These are, in most cases, absolutely unnecessary to those who carry on the Christian life and warfare in the actual world. *There* almost every turn of life—conversation, action, &c.—furnishes us with an opportunity of mortification; we need not go out of the public school of the world for any private practice. And there can be no doubt this latter mode of discipline is much *superior* both in variety and *genuine* probation. Men disciplining themselves in cells and deserts unawares flatter their own weaknesses in even their very tortures. The difference is that between bodily exercise in a private gymnasium and the actual exertion of a *real* wrestling-match or race; or it is the difference between a musician's practice of his own preludes, which he unconsciously suits to his own previous capabilities and tastes, and the practice of a new series of studies written by other composers without any relation to *his* special powers. Every practical musician knows how very different is the value of these exercises as a means of attaining true skill on the instrument.'

'The "charity" of St. Paul (in 1 Cor. xiii.) seems best described, if under any single notion, as *the opposite to selfishness* taking that term in the largest sense, the grace which habituates man in everything to lose and resign *self*. Whether in favour of God or of our neighbour, it is still the same humble, unforced,

Digitized by Google

habitual forgetfulness of self. And thus it is at the same time distinguished from mere "self-denial" by being done with perfect ease and happiness; it is thence a far higher attainment. It is no longer so much a *denial* of self as an oblivion of self: the self-sacrifice becomes almost unconscious from the mind and heart being fixed, not upon their own state, but upon the object of their affection.'

The following brief poem illustrates his power of expressing fresh thoughts in words not wanting in the 'natural magic' of true poetry:

'THE VOICE OF FRIENDSHIP.

'Oh, hush! *Thou* canst not teach me to distrust
The world's bright seeming; other lips than thine
Must teach me earthly beauty is but dust,
That we can friendship change, or love resign.

'As well the rose might with its scented breath,
And crimson leaves moist with the dew of Heaven,
Proclaim its birthplace as a vale of death,
Where the reed boweth and the oak is riven.

'Thou art so lovely in thy flowery youth,
A sadder voice must tell of death to me;
So constant art thou in thy guileless truth,
Oh! I may learn distrust, but not of thee.

'Ah, no, a sweeter duty shall be thine,
When I have learned Earth's coldest, sternest word,
When faith misplaced has caused me to repine,
And dark forebodings have my spirit stirred,

'Then shall the music of thy tones remind me,
Like breath of roses on a wintry day,
That howsoe'er the drifting storm may blind me,
Not *all* the beautiful hath passed away!'

The following lines also illustrate his possession of the true poetic gift:

'So the blind pupil of a blessed art
Feels her dim way along the indented page,
Her quick touch ministrant to sightless orbs,
While meanings mantle o'er her upraised face,
Like converse with an unseen visitant
Or strange revealings of an inward light.'

Digitized by Google

'Our hearts are prophets of the coming time—
Our hopes—our fears—our very recollections—
Each earthly throb holds promises sublime
And all the future burns in man's affections.'

It was urged upon Archer Butler by his friends that he ought to choose the law as his profession, but he shrank from the turmoil of the law courts. He loved literature and moral science, and his habits and pursuits inclined him strongly to a university life. About the year 1833 his thoughts began to incline him to the Christian ministry as a calling for which his talents were suited.

'My mind is almost made up' (he wrote to his eldest sister), 'every additional hour's consideration fixes it more strongly on my mind that every motive which can influence a rational being in choosing the colour of his life fixes me in the Church . . . . my main reason is a conviction of my own impressible weakness, and a certainty that to enter the legal profession—the most utterly worldly in existence—would be in effect to systematically banish reflexion; while, frail and unsettled as I now am, to enter the Church would be to place my mind in the very *sunshine* of religious feeling—where from the very nature of my profession it is impossible but religion must accost me every hour. But you know that to others this mightiest of all imaginable arguments may appear wholly unintelligible. Well, then, to them I may mention the worldly advantages of this course. Every man should examine his own powers and act by that examination. Now I do not hesitate to say that if I pursue the Law, there are ten chances to one against my ever attaining worldly eminence; and that the very qualifications, whatever be their degree, which form my *forte* would actually disqualify me for legal eminence. My powers, such as they are, lie almost entirely on the side of the imagination. They are the powers which would lie dormant in law; they are the very powers which would come into full play in the Church. They are the powers which it is but one case in a hundred gives scope to in the law (such as a case of false imprisonment, seduction, liberty of the Press invaded, or some such), where an ornate speech is required; while they are the powers that every Sunday's sermon calls for in the Church. . . . On the whole I do really think that even on these temporal grounds the case is decidedly in favour of the Church. When I think of the Law, life seems a path of toil ending in a

Digitized by Google

comfortless death; when I think of the Church, it brightens into a pleasing and glorious service not unlikely to bring "the favour of man" as well as of God, and ending in undescribable bliss.'

In 1834 Provost Lloyd introduced the system of Moderatorships, with gold or silver medals, at the degree examination in Dublin University. At first there were only three subjects in which these distinctions could be gained, namely, Classics, Mathematics, and Logic and Ethics. William Archer Butler was the first graduate of the University to gain a Moderatorship in Mental and Moral Science. After this he continued to reside in Trinity College for two and a half years, until a happy turn took place in his affairs through the wise discrimination of the Provost. The latter perceived the young graduate's extraordinary abilities, and caused a professorship in Philosophy to be founded in 1837, to the chair of which he was appointed, being at the same time presented to the prebend of Clondehorka, in the diocese of Raphoe, Co. Donegal.

'Is not this' (he writes) 'a great favour of Providence? Suddenly to be placed on an elevation so distinguished as to hold (*actually created for me*) such a post as Stewart and Brown and Reid held and Wilson holds! And to have joined with it that peaceful pastoral care which always formed one of my fondest dreams of life. . . . I am earnestly hoping that I may be worthy of my calling—and I feel some encouragement in the state of my heart—but I can say nothing until I am fairly embarked in it as to whether I am fit to carry and happy in carrying the standard of my Redeemer.'

He was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Ardagh on May 4, 1837, and priest a few months later. He soon adapted himself to his new life, which with its union of contemplation and action was almost an ideally suitable one to a man of his tastes. He rejoiced that once more his lot lay in the country, and in a district so picturesque as Donegal. This county has a character and charm of its own, with its deep land-locked bays and rocky shores, its peaty moors and barren mountains, its rain and mists and brown rushing rivers. The people also are unlike any other in Ulster;

Digitized by Google

they are a western race, gentle and melancholy, a deep-feeling and affectionate people.

A brief register of his days and studies, begun in 1839, shews how strenuous was the life Archer Butler led in his new sphere. He seems not to have had the assistance of a curate, except when he left Dunfanaghy to take up his studies in Dublin as Professor of Philosophy. He preached and lectured in his parish very frequently—sometimes in as many as six places during one week. He catechized the children in the schools twice a week for two hours. Besides visiting his parishioners he read many hours daily at philosophy and theology, wrote up his lectures, and composed his sermons for delivery in Dublin churches, or prepared speeches on the education question or some other subject of the day, for he was already becoming widely known as a speaker and preacher. He sometimes went to Dublin for a single day to preach or speak, making the long coach journey in twenty-four hours each way. His register shews that he studied widely on the Church and its history. He read the Apostolic Fathers. He frequently read a book of three hundred or four hundred pages in a day.

'*Sunday, July* 14, 1839.—Read Newman on justification—a noble writer surely! *24th* inst., noted some pages of harmony.' (Woodward speaks of his 'exquisite skill in music' and his care to instruct the village choir.) 'Read *Tracts for the Times*, No. 80 (83 pages). *October* 20.—Scaled Muckish mountain. *November* 1.—Wrote half a lecture on Platonic Philosophy. *November* 2.—Wrote the other half of lecture. Good work these two days.' At a great meeting in Belfast in July 1840 he delivered a speech on religious education, which was printed afterwards and attracted much attention. He also journeyed to Leeds and Liverpool, and spoke and preached for Dr. Hook on the same subject. The *British Critic* (June 1840) speaks highly of two sermons on education,[1] published by him at that time, calling them 'a noble testimony from the sister University to genuine Catholic doctrine.' Many letters were written to him in appreciation of these sermons,

[1] See *Sermons* (1849), p. 507.

Digitized by Google

among others by the Archbishop of Canterbury and J. H. Newman. 'May the zeal and devotion thus evinced,' says the latter, 'meet with abundant fruit in Ireland. Our Church could do anything humanly speaking, if it knew its own strength, and if its members were at peace with each other.'

He sometimes had visitors. '*August* 6, 1840.—In the evening came Professor Sewell, Lord Adare (afterwards Lord Dunraven), &c. &c., hither. *7th.*—Sailed to Tory Island. *8th.*—Most of the party left Dunfanaghy. Lord Adare remained here.' During term Butler resided in Trinity College, Dublin, and lectured twice a week on philosophy. He was thus absent from his parish for four months in the year. While in Dublin he preached 'passim,' as his register states. We have an entry, 'Preached at the Molyneux Asylum for the blind. An immense crowd present, and the collection amounted to 18*l.*'

The subject of his published lectures was the *History of Ancient Philosophy*. They were written when he was about twenty-eight years of age, and were published in 1856, long after his death, by Professor Thompson of Cambridge, afterwards Master of Trinity. In the preface he gives an appreciation of Butler's contributions to philosophy. The masterly *Letters on Development* led him 'to rank him among the most gifted spirits of his generation.' At that time little had been published in England on the history of Ancient Philosophy, and this book was warmly welcomed.

The earlier series is spoiled to a great degree by the rhetorical pomp of style. The lectures on Plato and the Platonists shew that Butler had carefully studied the original authorities. Thompson called them 'a perfectly independent contribution to our knowledge of the great master of Grecian wisdom.'

'Of the Dialectic and Physics of Plato they are the only exposition at once accurate and popular with which I am acquainted, being more accurate than the French and incomparably more popular than the German treatises on those departments of Plato's philosophy. The lectures on Plato's successors are concluded with a brilliant one on Neo-Platonism. . . . Taken as a whole the lectures constitute a history of the Platonic

Digitized by Google

philosophy—its seed-time, maturity, and decay, and it is no slight honour to the University of Dublin (he concludes) to have furnished such a history, written by an uncompromising defender of Catholic truth as well as of the historical evidences of Christianity.'[1]

He also speaks of his intimate acquaintance with the metaphysical writings of the eighteenth century, and especially with the English and Scotch school of psychology. J. T. Ball, afterwards Lord Chancellor of Ireland, was among the listeners in the lecture room, which was always crowded. 'Butler,' he says, 'possessed that singular faculty of rapidly assimilating all varieties of intellectual aliment which gives to some men the power of mastering books and systems by seizing at once the fundamental ideas, while others are losing their way among the details.'

Critics of that day discerned in these lectures the rapid growth of his mind, and were even more strongly impressed by what the author was capable of than by what he achieved.[2] Sir William Hamilton considered the book to possess great scientific value on account of the learning and acuteness with which the subject was treated. It was for a time part of the course of philosophy in Trinity College, Dublin, but has long been superseded by more modern works.

Archer Butler was indefatigable in visiting his parishioners, especially the sick. The members of his flock, which numbered more than two thousand, were scattered over an extensive district along the shores of the Atlantic. A clergyman who visited the parish seven years after his incumbency described the love and veneration of the people for his memory as absolutely marvellous. They spoke of his fine bodily presence, his great love of the children, and his limitless generosity. It was said of him at the time of his death that his best panegyric was the deep-toned sorrow of all who knew him in the character of a pastor. Parochial work in those days was no doubt less exacting than it is now, but it is stated that 'in the abodes of misery, by the death-beds of the poor, in scenes of famine and contagion

[1] *Lectures on Ancient Philosophy*, Preface, pp. x, xi.

[2] *Edinburgh Review*, July 1856.

Digitized by Google

he was ever active as a ministering angel. His lofty speculations were in a moment cheerfully laid aside at every call of sorrow and of suffering.'

In 1842 he was preferred to the living of Raymochy, on Lough Swilly, and reappointed to his professorship for another period of five years. His life in his new parish was but a continuation of the life of earnest study and steady pastoral work which he led during his five years at Dunfanaghy. The outline of each year's occupation is the same; at the end of November he left his parish in charge of a curate, and taking up his residence in Trinity College lectured three times a week during the short term before Christmas. He then usually proceeded to his brother's place, Garnavilla, near Clonmel, to see his sisters, and while spending a month or six weeks there enjoyed a good deal of the pleasant society, military and civilian, of the neighbourhood. He also preached in the churches round about, for wherever he was his services as a preacher were in incessant demand. In those days men were better listeners than they are at present, for he records that his sermon on February 12, 1843, at St. Michan's Church, Dublin, occupied an hour and a quarter in delivery. In February and March he continued his work as Professor of Moral Philosophy, and lectured in Trinity College, and in April or May he returned to his parish to devote his whole time again to his parishioners and his severe course of studies. The Church population of Raymochy parish at that time was about 430. The average congregation was 111, of monthly communicants 42, and at Easter and Christmas 90. There were many Presbyterians also in the parish and a large Roman Catholic population. Dr. Ball, afterwards Lord Chancellor, tells us that during the session of 1842 Butler delivered ethical lectures, and that they were more practical in their bearing and simpler in their style. His audience fancied that his clerical experience had sobered his tendency to theory and abstraction, and that he seemed more anxious while on this ground to do general good than to dazzle his audience with either subtle refinement or brilliant conceptions. These lectures were delivered extempore, and the 'solemn and

Digitized by Google

methodical' style of his written lectures on the history of philosophy was exchanged for one characterized rather by a familiarity and practical earnestness suited to a theme so immediately coming home to men's daily lives. The notes of these lectures shew that they were on the history of ethical philosophy.

It was shortly after his promotion to Raymochy that he preached at the visitation of the diocese of Derry and Raphoe. This sermon, 'Primitive Church Principles not Inconsistent with Universal Christian Sympathy,' was published at the time.[1] He takes a high view of the importance of the primitive system of the Church as the express creation of her Master and as the ordinary revealed instrument of His blessings to man, but he urges that there are real graces external to the apostolic succession. 'We may fairly take the facts (of piety, &c.) as proofs that it was not God's purpose absolutely to confine His gifts to it, *whatever may have been the anticipation of the primitive Church, which was without that experience.*' Butler was undoubtedly in his day in the front rank as a preacher and speaker. As a rule he spoke from very brief notes, but during the earlier years of his ministry his more elaborate discourses were written out beforehand and either delivered from memory or read. A second volume of his sermons was edited in 1856 by James A. Jeremie, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, who says of the sermons contained in it, 'They are marked by the same originality and vigour of expression, the same richness of imagery and illustration, the same views and catholic spirit, and the same depth and fervour of devotional feeling which so remarkably distinguished the preceding series.'

Dean Woodward tells us that Butler frequently interposed spoken passages even in his carefully written sermons, and adds that 'his finely modulated voice, his earnest manner, his animated delivery all commanded the attention, while his well laid emphasis continually marked the prominent idea and threw a light upon trains of thought which without such an aid the reader may sometimes find it

[1] See vol. i. of his *Sermons*, p. 458.

Digitized by Google

difficult to follow.' His style of preaching to cultivated congregations was compared by his friends to Massillon's. The present Archbishop of Armagh in a private letter (March 1902) sums up his recollection of Butler as a preacher and a man in these words: 'He was the man of most transcendent genius I have ever met and one of the sweetest and kindliest of the sons of men.' Long before, Mr. Alexander, when curate of Londonderry, in preaching in the cathedral on the Sunday after Archer Butler's death, had spoken of him as

'struck down in the midst of a career of usefulness, with a glowing prospect opened before his advancing footsteps, possessed of a mind just beginning to feel and to put forth its native vigour, at the meridian of an eloquence as rich in thought and matter as it was prodigally exuberant of beauty, combining great power with great promptitude, making his massive faculties even more considerable by a versatile gracefulness in using them . . . . Gifted with the indescribable winningness of genius, humble as a child and of a lovableness of character for which natural goodness of heart could never account.'

He refers to the ordination sermon preached a few weeks before.

'Surely until we are borne like him to the cold grave there will be enshrined in the inmost casket of recollection the love that glowed in his manner and in his voice as he unfolded the spiritual meaning of that passage of St. John, "Who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"'

Spending four or five months each year in Dublin Butler was eagerly sought for as a preacher, and was frequently heard in the University pulpit, in the Chapel Royal (he had been appointed chaplain to the Lord Lieutenant in 1841), or in St. Stephen's or other parochial churches. His name is still warmly cherished in his own University as one of her most brilliant sons during the nineteenth century; he was the subject of a celebration sermon no longer ago than Trinity Monday 1906, a day on which every year some former alumnus is commemorated at a festival service

Digitized by Google

held before the annual banquet for scholars past and present.

Dean Woodward gives a record of the impression which Archer Butler made on his intimate friends in his private life.

'It was in the unreserved intercourse of friendly conversation that the faculties of Professor Butler seemed to find their happiest exercise. His multifarious knowledge was communicated on the most trivial suggestion, yet without effort or display. The profound reflexion, the subtle analysis, the most pungent wit dropped from him in brilliant succession, while he appeared entirely unsconcious that he was speaking more than ordinary words.'

Alas! not one fragment of his conversation has come down to us.

It is by his sermons, however, that Archer Butler is best remembered. He possessed the rare combination of analytical power and poetical imagination, that true genius which begins by condensation and generalization and goes on to realization and expansion. Hence, whether he is preaching for a charitable institution, such as an asylum for the blind, treating of some theological mystery, such as the Trinity or the existence of evil, or enforcing some practical duty, he goes at once to first principles, but he treats them so devotionally as to commend them no less to the affections than to the intellect. This enunciation of foundation truths in eloquent and original language it is which makes his sermons lend themselves to quotation, and such extracts are no mere purple patches, the outcome of forced rhetorical display, but the natural and forcible expression of deep though often familiar truths. If we take for example his beautiful sermon on 'The Daily Self-Denial of Christ' we shall see that in it he deals with the great principle that 'virtue tried and triumphant ranks above innocence.' He touches on the mystery of the existence of evil in the world, how the springing of good out of evil disproves the Manichæan idea of two equal and opposing principles by setting the good above the evil, and then with great force he demonstrates how suffering tends to produce humbleness of mind, a disposition in which he finds the very

Digitized by Google

essence of Christianity and which is exemplified and raised to its highest power in Christ Himself.

'The cross,' he adds, 'is a large and comprehensive word, but with whatever variety applied to individuals, it cannot lose its essential nature; it still carries the nails that pierce the body and the shame that penetrates the soul. Wherever it rises upon the page of Scripture, it cannot but bring with it the shadow of pain and trouble; wherever it is planted, whatever be the celestial consolations, surely the daily world can no longer be the pleasant world it was of old. Wherever it is erected, surely, as at first, there will be "darkness over all the earth," even though that darkness may make the stars of heaven shine more brightly.'

A holiday visit to the Lake district in Westmorland which Archer Butler enjoyed in the summer of 1844 was counted by him as one of the greatest pleasures he had ever experienced. He explored the scenery of the lakes and joined in long walking expeditions with Sir W. R. Hamilton, the Irish Astronomer Royal, Archdeacon Hare, and Miss Arnold and Miss Maurice. His host, R. P. Graves, was in charge of the parish of Bowness, and lived in the rectory, not far from Rydal Mount, so that frequent visits were paid to Wordsworth, the philosophic poet, for whom the poetic philosopher shewed an ingenuous enthusiasm. A MS. poem, sent to his sister with the poet's autograph, idealizes the scene.

'Mightiest of all the laurelled lineage high,
He sate—as when in Fancy's golden gleam,
He saw deep visions by the sylvan Wye,
Or drew his childhood's bright Platonic dream.

'The brighter noontide hours in converse grave
And high had passed, with him our glorious guest,
Winander fondling still with playful wave
The faery barge that rocked her Poet's rest.

'He taught how men may rise to Soul through Sense,
Of that diviner vision which can see
Symbols in narrow Space of God's immense,
Shadows in Time of God's eternity.

Digitized by Google

'Of man—the sorrows humble souls endure,
The one great Heart that beats in all who move
O'er earth, the peaceful glories of the Poor
And all the meek sublime of human love . . . '

Mr. Graves states that

'Butler's fine enthusiasm and his companionable pleasantness made him the delight of the whole party. Many were the animated discussions which took place between these men, so powerful in intellect, so affluent in all the resources of knowledge, so brilliant in conversational eloquence and wit, so genial and unassuming in disposition and withal so constantly regardful of Christian principle in the exercise of their many gifts.'

On one occasion when one of the party stated that Byron shewed few signs of accurate observation of nature, and most present seemed to agree, Butler cited as an example to the contrary the image in the couplet—

'Yet, Freedom! yet thy banner, torn but flying,
Streams like the thunder-storm against the wind';

and Wordsworth assented, saying that he considered this to be the finest image in Byron's poetry, and, as displaying a grand ideal truth symbolized by an equally grand and correspondingly unusual phenomenon of the outer world, scarcely to be surpassed. The same witness also noted the simple earnestness with which the paramount importance of the truths of Christianity was upheld and enforced by a man possessed of so strong an intellect and such warm affections, and felt that this made his religious conversation deeply impressive; and the remarkable impressiveness of his preaching arose doubtless from the same cause. He twice occupied the pulpit in Bowness Church on the Sunday mornings, preaching from the texts, 'They crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh' (Heb. vi. 6), and, 'Behold, I am alive for evermore' (Rev. i. 18).

'Most striking' (Mr. Graves records) 'was the effect of the former sermon, in which he showed how the original crucifixion of our Lord was the natural result of the habitual feelings and practices of its guilty perpetrators, and that the very same corrupt feel-

Digitized by Google

ings and practices are constantly and habitually at work among ourselves, and under similar circumstances would produce a similar result. The power and truth of the analysis of human nature as now operating in the world around us, by which he sustained his argument, were really startling, and several of the congregation, struck by the lesson they had received, expressed to me their wish to subscribe towards the publication of the sermons of such a preacher.'

Both these sermons are contained in the first volume of his published sermons.[1] Butler, in a letter to his sister, records how on one of these Sundays he also preached in the evening at Ambleside Church,

'where there was a curious festival, a rural ornamenting of the church that takes place annually, some strange relic of old times. I brought a written sermon and had it actually on the cushion before me, and, suddenly struck by its being unsuitable to the congregation, substituted another text and preached from the occasion—a somewhat Irish feat of audacity!'

Of this discourse Mr. Graves relates that it was universally commended and admired.

About this time Butler defended Mr. Gladstone, who had been attacked in a Dublin paper by a correspondent who accused him of first holding 'the Pusey heresy' and then recanting. Butler shewed that the heresy and the recantation were alike imaginary. This brought him a grateful letter from Gladstone, in which, after expressing his thanks for the able statement thus made on his behalf, he goes on to speak of the growing difficulties of supporting the Irish Church,

'not only because the tone of thought in the region of politics was becoming more and more alien from the principle which sustained the Irish Church, but also because unhappily the clergy of that Church do not seem to grow as a body in the due appreciation of their own position, and I fear that in consequence they are gradually losing their hold over the clergy and most attached members of the Church of England. This, however, certainly ought to increase English sympathy towards you and those who think with you in Ireland.'

[1] Vol. I. pp. 49 *sqq.* 164 *sqq.*

Digitized by Google

In 1845 Newman published his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, and in the succeeding winter Archer Butler wrote a series of *Letters on Development* in answer to the essay. These were published in the Irish *Ecclesiastical Journal*, and immediately attracted attention. In a private letter (February 21, 1846) Butler says of Newman's work:

'It is very seductively written; indeed to confess the truth I was very nervous about taking it with me to the country at all; it is no trifle to be shut up in a lonely house to wrestle with such an athlete. However, I took courage as I got over the leaves; for with all its ability and attractiveness it is (as you may collect even from my criticisms) exposed at many points. The interest of the subject has drawn attention to the letters such as they are; I understand that W. Cantuar. and C. J. London. have been pleased to talk about them, an event which may remind you of the close of P. P.'s (Swift's hero's) account of the reputation of his views in Parliament! What you say of the Apostles' developments is very true; probably most of their teaching would be found involved in our Lord's brief deep sayings, and if Rome could prove that she really has a guidance as infallible as her own St. Peter had, we would, of course, bow before this authority of *her* developments too; but until she does, we have no recourse but of reason and logical conclusions. After all, the most satisfactory way to meet such a system as Newman's is to show what it might be made to lead to and thus drive it to ridiculous conclusions, which accordingly I do in the number now coming out.'

The Letters are nine in number, the first published in December 1845 and the last in November 1846. They were collected and edited, after Butler's death, by Thomas Woodward in 1850. Bishop Christopher Wordsworth had expressed an earnest wish that they should be circulated more extensively, and Bishop Thirlwall, as we saw, counted them the best of the many answers given to Newman's theory.

William Fitzgerald, afterwards Bishop of Killaloe, who was a pupil of Archer Butler and who succeeded him in the chair of Moral Philosophy, refers in his *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History* to these Letters. After speaking of Butler as 'a man whose genius will be long admired, not only in this University, whose fostering care he repaid by the

Digitized by Google

lustre which he flung around her name, but throughout the British Churches,' he contrasts him with his opponent in this controversy.

'Both were learned, both expert dialecticians, both masters of no vulgar rhetoric. But the causes in which these potent arms are wielded are not more different than the spirit which actuated the combatants. One heartily believing in the power of reason to elicit truth and faithfully applying that power to its discovery; the other avowedly sceptical upon this point, without faith in the efficacy of the instrument which he affects to use, choosing first the object of his belief, and then looking round for topics to vindicate that belief to the intellects of other men.'

The new theory was at first repudiated by some Romanist authorities, but it was afterwards adopted by many as a short and easy way of freeing the defenders of Romanism from a multitude of controversies on which the voice of antiquity was clearly against them. Butler calls the theory an intellectual romance. He shews how it can be applied to every form of Christianity actually existing, the Greek Church, the Anglican, and Protestantism, which are all developments. Therefore the additional assumption of Papal infallibility must be made; it can decide what is to be received and what rejected; but it is itself a development; and therefore the argument revolves in a circle. 'Thus mutually confronted the development and the infallibility hang their heads like two detected witnesses who appeal to each other for a character.' And in these circumstances the decision of a developing Church can only be provisional, because it may be set aside by the Church of the future. The Letters are full of acute reasoning and wit, and it is wonderful to think that they were composed in intervals snatched from the tasks of ministering to his flock, delivering his lectures in Dublin, and attending committee meetings to arrange for famine relief funds. This and the fact of their controversial nature may account for their plain and unadorned style, so different from that of his sermons and lectures. They constitute a remarkable proof of his powers of concentration and mental energy.

Digitized by Google

Butler was much in sympathy with the Catholic revival and followed its progress with deep interest. He felt, like many others, that the practical side of Christianity had been neglected in the teaching of the Evangelical party, and that the view of the Church in her corporate capacity had been to a great extent lost sight of. As early as 1837, just before his ordination, he wrote to Graves:

'I remember you were admiring Alexander Knox's writings when last we met; you have of course seen that two additional volumes have been published. I cannot but think that the tone of his views (though perhaps a little partial and exaggerated) is eminently calculated to do good at this time. Strong medicines are required for pressing cases, and, if he were more accurately equitable in his views of the two aspects of Christianity, he would not effect so much. No question of it he presses on the side where the balance has been lost—the side of practical sanctity.'

And again some years later (February 26, 1846):

'Meantime the thing we want is the practical exhibition of real Catholic principles and institutions; it is the air of self-denial and deep devotion that they observe among the Romanists that is winning all these men over. So impressive is the beauty of their establishments for education that for my own part I confess I should be afraid to go much among them, and unfortunately (!) Romanism is witnessed in England in its best dress, meek, self-denying, profoundly devotional; while on the other side are arrayed the *Record*, Baptist Noel, and Exeter Hall! What wonder if men whose tastes have come to be formed in the ancient school should incline to the former? Oh that we had some thoroughly courageous and yet discreet bishop who would show what might be done when Anglicanism was taken out of the dead letter of the Prayer Book and translated into life and action!'

He was not blind, however, to the dangers involved in the wild utterances of Ward and some of the extreme party.

'I understand,' he writes (September 24, 1844), 'from an intelligent quarter there (England) that the ultra-Catholics are beginning to maintain that the Papal is really the Catholic Church in Ireland, and can fairly claim all the privileges of that

Digitized by Google

position. Curious if the Catholic revolution in England, after inflaming the Presbyterians against us here, should end by placing our necks under the heel of Rome! Have you read Ward's book? It is avowedly and undisguisedly Roman; indeed he treats as absolutely ludicrous the notion of comparing the two Churches; though at the same time stating that he never himself for an instant wavered as to the duty of continuing in communion with the English Church. Still he puts in strong and useful light the deficiency of our Church in the great business of individual spiritual direction, and probably the attention drawn to that point will eventuate in good, *e.g.* in the composition or compilation of books directed to that most momentous object in which, as you know, the Roman Church abounds, through its machinery of the confessional and the necessity of preparing its priests for that function.'

In his speech on Church education, delivered in Belfast in 1840, he insists first on the right of every living soul to have unrestricted access to the Scriptures, the fundamental documents of the Christian Faith, but he conjoins with this a second principle,

'the right of every soul baptized into the Church of Christ to receive those forms of doctrine, discipline and worship which that Church proposes to his acceptance as by her guarded and perpetuated from the days of Christ to the present hour. This stamps the Church of Ireland as Catholic in relation to that form of Protestantism which exaggerates and perverts the principles of liberty. This right of the Church is for her own children and assumes the possession by her of an ancient inheritance of systematic truth. Opening the Scripture to all and thus proclaiming the authority to which she bows, the test by which she wills to be tried, she yet with equal firmness maintains the truth of her own immemorial interpretation, the inherited forms and worship, and belief (as she asserts) of unanimous antiquity.'

It is for not one but both of these first principles of religious education for her sons that the Church of England has now to contend.

The autumn of 1846 brought with it the dreaded potato blight, and the whole district of Donegal felt the full force of it and seemed face to face with starvation. In his letters

Digitized by Google

Butler speaks of the tremendous problem of 'an overgrown population of paupers always on the edge of famine with but one plank—this pernicious potato—between them at all times and starvation, and this now suddenly disappearing.' He was himself incessantly occupied with the work of famine relief, and his own boundless generosity in the two years of scarcity is still remembered in the district. In some parts of Ireland the giving of relief was alleged to have been the occasion of attempts to proselytize, and a storm at once arose on the subject. Daniel O'Connell accused the Irish Society publicly of refusing relief to the starving poor unless they disobeyed their consciences and relinquished their faith. Butler and other clergy took up the cry and denounced such methods in the daily Press. They drew imaginary pictures of an odious system of religious tyranny.

'Famishing multitudes' (said Butler) 'are competitors for the means of existence. As brother men they gather to our doors imploring aid. The voice is feeble with exhaustion, or the voice gives way to that gloomy silence of hopelessness so fearfully familiar to us now, and we gently suggest to the despairing father the Bible without note or comment; we hold forth food, but he must reach for it through the iron grating of the Thirty-nine Articles! We set his hunger against his creed!'

The Society replied that its rules forbade the readers to force the Scriptures on the attention of any who did not wish to hear them.

Butler, in his letter to the Dublin *Evening Mail*, noted that the terrible visitation of famine did much to draw all classes and creeds together. He would leave great revolutions in religion to Providence, content in the meantime to observe how one principle at least shone out in its old immutable brightness, how that great law of love which our Divine Founder made the main characteristic of His religion still even in the most adverse circumstances exercised its inherent tendency to unite. He hinted also at the risk incurred in disturbing the habitual convictions of any sincerely religious man. It may sometimes be a duty to do so, but not unless immense care be taken to replace those

Digitized by Google

convictions with others as effective over the heart and life. Low, mixed, or uncertain motives to righteousness are better than none.

For some time before his death Archer Butler had been engaged in studying the subject of Faith and collecting materials for a work upon it. Some finished and a great mass of unfinished materials for this exist among his papers. He was deeply dissatisfied with the views of Bishop O'Brien upon the subject. Writing to Graves of Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*, he says: 'The middle part of the book is taken up with a fierce onslaught on Bishop O'Brien's views on faith, which may produce an interesting controversy. Do you remember our colloquy with Archdeacon Hare on the subject? Ward's objections are not wholly dissimilar, but urged with savage fury.'

O'Brien relied almost entirely on faith as trust, an emotion directed towards a Person. He contrasts 'believing the truths contained in the Word of God' with 'that trust or confidence which such belief ought to produce,' and says that the latter alone is the faith mentioned in the New Testament. Butler denies this: 'trust or faith,' he says, 'is not a *separate act subsequent to the belief of anything affirmed in Scripture*,' and this is so whether we contemplate that trust (or faith) as an intellectual act, or an emotion, or as a combination of both. It is the desiring intelligence and belief of what actually is in sacred Scripture. He wishes to bring out more clearly the intellectual element of faith.

'It seems to me that such *trust* is itself habitual belief of certain truths contained in the Word of God, viz. those that affirm the mercifulness of God in Christ to all who humbly seek Him, in which of course is necessarily involved His mercifulness to *me*, humbly seeking Him.'

'For it is not as though I believed Him merciful to all and thence inferred His mercy to me; in believing Him merciful to all I directly affirm His mercy to me and all others. My fulness of personal trust is only my dwelling upon part of the message set forth in Scripture, addressed as it is to me and to all. It is therefore direct belief of a Scriptural truth so far as it is a well grounded trust. So far as trust or confidence is an intellectual

Digitized by Google

act, so far it is the belief of my part in certain Scriptural affirmations which were really intended to include me as well as all others, in which I (so and so qualified) am constructively *named*. This identifies the object of faith with the Word of God, an important point; and thus rightly limits the trust to the revelation itself, and so checks all tendency to presumption—while at the same time it raises faith out of the position of a mere emotion, as trust or confidence is so often classed, for if faith be not peculiarly intellectual, what grace will remain to sanctify the understanding?'

O'Brien's view is still held by many. It may be found stated in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*,[1] where Professor Warfield of Princeton, represents faith as a vague 'reliance on God' rather than belief in His promises or covenant, revealed to us in Scripture and sealed to us in Sacraments. He speaks of this as an emotion rather than as intellectual assent, as though the reliance did not arise out of the conviction or belief, his own instance (Gen. xv. 6) being a striking case of belief in a revealed statement rather than the vague reliance on God Himself which he makes it. Faith is no mysterious gift laid we know not how in the lap of the souls of some men only and 'not grounded in the heart's own potencies,' but it includes a belief of the definite truths which are matters of revelation, and it *originates* in the acceptance of these truths by the understanding and the heart; thus faith, as Butler contends, must carry with it the idea of (1) fixed habitual belief, for it is belief of a character, which is something permanent, also (2) practical belief, for it implies that we feel a personal interest in the matter of the belief and appropriate the benefit to ourselves.

At the same time Butler does not overlook the difference in practical bearing between faith as an habitual conviction of truths and faith as an habitual reliance on a Person (though the latter can no doubt be resolved into habitual belief of truths relative to the Person).

'There is something peculiar in affection to a person quite distinct from belief of impersonal truths. This indeed seems rooted in the social nature of man. Our affections gather round

[1] *Op. cit.* vol. i. Art. 'Faith.'

Digitized by Google

the voluntary personal centre of good to us. To believe that a certain good is to redound to us, and to believe that a certain person is the willing producer and means of the good, are very different. To the latter belong all the habitual emotions produced by the belief of a kind *will*.'

When on earth it was the main object of our Lord to produce the recognition in Him of those personal characteristics of divine power and benevolence which make up the Messianic character. This is what is meant by 'believing in Him' in St. John's Gospel.

'Every instance of belief which gained miraculous cures was really faith in His personal powers and goodness: that is, it was an inferior or inchoate form—more or less advancing to complete enlightenment—of the great general belief of His Messiahship. In many—perhaps most—cases He brought about the belief of His Messiahship through the ordinary channel of assertion backed by miraculous proof; in the cases of miraculous healings He made an equivalent supernatural impression on the recipient of His favour, and thus at once produced that state (for the purpose of perpetual exemplification) to which—in its general character—the others were to be gradually conducted. An influence above man was operative indeed in both; in the one case, however, working by the ordinary rational faculties; in the other more or less independently of them; which is just the difference between ordinary operations of the Holy Ghost and interior miracles.'

To the intellectual and emotional elements of faith here insisted on Westcott adds a third, volition.[1] When he was dying Butler expressed a wish that he had been permitted to live long enough to finish this work. His reading on the subject had been very wide, his views were somewhat eclectic, and it can be seen from the completed portions of the work that he would have brushed aside mere disputings about words and made a really valuable contribution to theology.

His death was tragic in its suddenness. He had gone to preach at an ordination at Dunboe, Co. Derry. Among those ordained on that occasion was the Rev. William

[1] See *The Historic Faith*, note 2, p. 174.

Digitized by Google

Alexander, now Primate of Ireland, who has given an account of Butler's sermon. He mentions that the preacher briefly characterized each of the great Anglican theologians whose writings he recommended his younger brethren to read. This he did in sentences *so startlingly beautiful* as almost *to take away the breath* of the listeners. On his return he caught a chill, which issued in typhus fever, and he passed away on July 5, 1847, at the early age of thirty-five. His death was universally lamented. By his learning, his logical power, and his natural force of intellect he seemed fitted to take a place among the leaders of religious thought of his time. All accounts of him agree as to his wonderfully attractive disposition and his charm of manner, his frank and joyful temperament, 'the indescribable charm of his conversation,' and his marvellous felicity of language; again, his freedom from the faults which beset the literary character, for he was absolutely free from envy or assumption. It struck his contemporaries that he possessed that essential characteristic of genius, the principle of progress; his mind was both versatile and original and he was unwearied in the acquisition of knowledge. It is difficult therefore to say what he might not have attained to had he lived.

He was buried in his own quiet country churchyard, a crowd of several thousands being present, whose 'burst of grief' was but a type of the wider sorrow of the Church which mourned for him as one of the most gifted of her sons.

Art. IV.—EVOLUTION AND MORALITY.

1. *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas.* By E. Westermarck. Volume I. (London: Macmillan & Co., 1906.)
2. *Morals in Evolution.* By L. T. Hobhouse. Two Volumes. (London: Chapman & Hall, 1906.)

Dr. Westermarck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* is a work on the Science of Ethics. As such, it has for its object, he tells us, not to establish rules for moral conduct,

Digitized by Google

but to study the moral consciousness as a fact[1]; and for the purpose of such a study it is not necessary to consider what validity such rules have, or indeed whether they have any. The case is, we suppose, the same with the Science of Ethics as it is with the Science of Religion: students of the latter science may study the origin and development of any form, or all forms, of religion without basing their researches and arguments on the assumption either that religion, in any of its forms, is true, or is not true. Whether religion is true is a question which cannot be settled by the Science of Religion; and in the same way the Science of Ethics cannot settle, and need not inquire, whether the rules for moral conduct which it studies have or have not any validity. Of course, we all have an opinion on such fundamental questions as these; and, with regard to ethics, Dr. Westermarck's opinion is that 'there are no general moral truths.' Different men, or societies of men, think and feel that they ought to act in certain ways—and that is all we can say. We cannot say, as a general moral truth, that in given circumstances every man ought to act or feel in a certain way. It is therefore interesting to observe that according to Dr. Westermarck men actually do say what in his opinion they should not say—viz. that every man ought to do and feel certain things. 'Society is the school' in which they learn to say this. 'The headmaster is Custom and the lessons are the same for all. The first moral judgments were pronounced by public opinion,'[2] and the lesson was that every boy in the school ought to act and feel in a certain way: that there were certain moral truths which were true for everybody. Private judgement in this stage did not exist, as Dr. Westermarck admits when he says 'the original form of the moral consciousness cannot have been the individual's own conscience.'[3] If we inquire, then, as to the origin of the moral emotions, Dr. Westermarck's reply is: 'Society is the birthplace of the moral consciousness; the first moral judgments expressed, not the private emotions of isolated individuals, but emotions which were

[1] *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, p. 18.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 9.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 123.

Digitized by Google

felt by the society at large; tribal custom was the earliest rule of duty.'[1] Transgression of the custom of the tribe or society calls forth public indignation; and as a member of the society 'I implicitly admit that the custom is equally binding for me and for you and for all the other members of the society.'[2] Further, as the moral emotions were in their origin emotions felt by society at large, so they are through all their development to the end: 'the moral emotions remain to the last public emotions—if not in reality, then as an ideal.' However, this development or evolution of the moral ideas 'is in no small degree effected by the efforts made by high-minded individuals to raise public opinion to their own standard of right.'[3] Not only are such individuals 'high-minded,' but they have a standard which, we infer, is really higher than public opinion, inasmuch as they succeed, or may succeed, in 'raising' public opinion to it. In those circumstances, then, we may remark, we have no difficulty in understanding that there is such a thing as moral progress, as Dr. Westermarck says there is: 'as will be seen, the evolution of the moral consciousness involves a progress in impartiality and justice.'[4] The reason presumably of the possibility of moral progress is that, while there are what Dr. Westermarck calls in chapter viii. enlightened moral judgements, there are, or have been, other judgements less enlightened: some persons have 'a higher morality, a moral standard more purified by reflection and impartiality' than others have.

Thus, it would seem, according to Dr. Westermarck, that private judgement on matters of morals is both the source of moral progress and the final court of appeal in such matters. Now this at least appears to be inconsistent with his other view that at the beginning private judgement did not exist, and that to the end moral emotions are not private but public, ideally if not actually. Yet, inconsistent or not, it seems to be deliberate. From the point of view that private judgement is the start and finish in the development of moral ideas, Dr. Westermarck says: 'My moral judgments are my own judgments; they spring from

[1] *Ibid.* p. 117 *sq.* [2] *Ibid.* p. 120. [3] *Ibid.* p. 123. [4] *Ibid.* p. 122.

Digitized by Google

my own moral consciousness; they judge of the conduct of other men, not from their own point of view, but from mine,'[1] and, springing, as it does, on this view, from my own moral consciousness, 'the moral law commands obedience'—from me, of course, not from others, because, as we have seen, 'there are no general moral truths.' Not only are there no general moral truths in the sense that there are none which command obedience from man generally, but there are none which command obedience from me at all times, for Dr. Westermarck does not admit 'every man's conscience to be an infallible guide'; and what commanded obedience from me at one time may not do so at another.

If we sort out the different opinions expressed by Dr. Westermarck, we find that there are three: one is that the ultimate moral authority is society; another is that the ultimate moral authority is the individual; and the third is that there is no ultimate authority whatever. From the first of these three points of view, moral judgements express emotions felt by society at large; and I recognize that they are binding for you, for me, and for all the other members of the society. This implies the statement, that I *ought* to feel them binding, to be a true statement. The second point of view appears to recognize—or perhaps to be necessitated by—the possibility of moral progress; one individual may be 'higher-minded' than others and 'raise' them to his own level. But it is only effected by denying that moral judgements express emotions felt by society at large, and by asserting that, in pronouncing moral judgements, I judge the conduct of other men not from the point of view of society at large but from my own point of view. It is the judgements which spring from my own moral consciousness that are binding on me, and not those which spring from the emotions felt by society at large. The statement, then, that I ought to feel the moral judgements of society to be binding, is not a true statement. I may be higher-minded than others (in my own opinion). And others may be higher-minded (in their own opinion) than I. Thus we come to Dr. Westermarck's third point of view—viz. that

[1] *Ibid.* p. 19.

Digitized by Google

there is no ultimate moral authority whatever. Neither in society nor in the individual do we find ultimate authority—any means of deciding absolutely whether my opinion or the opinion of others is the higher. And the philosophical reason for this, according to Dr. Westermarck's philosophy, is that general moral truths or moral principles 'owing to their very nature, can never be true.'[1] 'The ultimate reason for this is, that the moral concepts are based upon emotions, and that the contents of an emotion fall entirely outside the category of truth.'[2] Moral truths, then, are moral concepts; moral concepts are emotions; and emotions cannot be said in any intelligible sense to be either true or untrue. Therefore, according to Dr. Westermarck, the statement that I ought to do what society feels to be right (or the statement that I ought to do what I feel to be right) is a statement which is neither true nor false, but meaningless.

This conclusion (that it is meaningless to say I *ought* to do what is felt, whether by me or by society, to be right) is of no value either from the point of view of philosophy or of common sense. Its only interest is that it reveals the fallacy by which Dr. Westermarck is misled. A truth is not a concept: a truth is, and a concept is not, a proposition. A concept has meaning only as part of a proposition. The concept of duty is meaningless except as the subject or predicate of a proposition. To say that, therefore, as subject or predicate it is meaningless is absurd. On the other hand, it may be said that an emotion is felt, whether any proposition is made about it or not: an emotion is a feeling, and a feeling is felt, proposition or no proposition. But approval and disapproval are judgements, whatever more or whatever else they may be. Approval is possible only if there is some one who approves and something of which he approves: approval is a judgement, and a judgement is a proposition. When, then, Dr. Westermarck says: 'Moral emotions are of two kinds: disapproval and approval,'[3] and bases his inquiries into 'the nature of the moral emotions' on that statement, he commits himself to

[1] *Ibid.* p. 18. [2] *Ibid.* p. 17. [3] *Ibid.* p. 21.

Digitized by Google

implying either that moral emotions are judgements or else that moral approval and disapproval are not judgements and are not propositional. And it is on this ambiguity that his argument proceeds. When it is necessary to argue that the sense of duty or 'ought' has no validity and no objectivity, it is reduced to an emotion or feeling or concept which is not a proposition or a judgement, and which is, therefore, meaningless. And then we are told that 'there are no general moral truths.' When, on the other hand, the argument requires that there should be moral progress, then moral emotions are pronounced to be judgements, and progress is explained to be due to 'enlightened moral judgements.'

We will now take the point of view that there are moral judgements, whether enlightened or unenlightened; that they have a meaning; and that they carry, or are felt to carry, authority. They have a history. That history may be a process of evolution. But when the evolution has been traced and the history recorded, there still remains the question: what authority, if any, have they? And we will consider the answer to that question, given by Mr. Hobhouse in his *Morals in Evolution*.

The 'good' for each man, according to Mr. Hobhouse, 'lies in the realization of what is in him, the development of his personality.'[1] Now, in each man there are qualities which, if realized, will be destructive of society; and there are also qualities which, if realized, will promote the growth and the good of society. The latter qualities constitute the 'social personality' of the individual; and that they should be developed and realized is for the common good. From the point of view of the common good, it is desirable that the individual and the society should each develop the other—that society should develop the social personality of the individual, and that the individual should promote the growth of society and the social good. Whether, however, it is equally desirable for the individual to develop only the social side of his personality, to sacrifice himself, perhaps to give up his life and put an end to 'the develop-

[1] *Morals in Evolution*, i. 70.

Digitized by Google

ment of his personality' altogether, is not a question which can be settled by the mere statement—however true—that it is desirable, in the interests of other people, that the individual should limit or extinguish himself in this way. 'What form of development is best for the individual,' Mr. Hobhouse says, 'is a question of the ultimate basis of morals.'[1] We will, therefore, go on to see what it is that Mr. Hobhouse presents as the ultimate basis of morality—only remarking at present that the sacrifice of the individual's life for the good of the community cannot be regarded as a 'form of development' for the individual, if death is for the individual a terminus beyond which there is no further existence and no further development in any form.

The question of the ultimate basis of morality is a philosophical question: it is 'the philosophical question of the nature of moral obligation, of moral authority, of the moral sanction.'[2] But though the question is one of philosophy, it is impossible to consider it without considering the nature and history of religious belief, or without considering the claim of religion that it provides the required authority and imposes the necessary obligation. Mr. Hobhouse, therefore, traces the evolution of religious belief in some detail so far as it affects men's views on the nature of moral obligation. 'The central fact of evolution,' he holds, 'is the slowly wrought out dominance of mind in things.'[3] 'The conditions of life'—originally if we understand Mr. Hobhouse aright, not under the dominance of any mind whatever—'come more and more under the dominion of Mind.'[4] This view is, of course, very different from 'a purely teleological doctrine of the world process,' for such a doctrine implies that the conditions of life, and of everything else, do not come more and more under the dominion of Mind, but are under it from the beginning, and to the end work under the conditions and for the end imposed by it. To this doctrine Mr. Hobhouse prefers the hypothesis of 'a spirit subject to conditions and achieving its full growth only by mastering them.' Naturally, there-

[1] *Morals in Evolution*, i. 70.
[2] *Ibid.* ii. 1.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. 284.
[4] *Ibid.* ii. 280.

Digitized by Google

fore, his examination of the nature and history of religious belief leads to the conclusion that the basis of moral authority and moral obligation is not to be found in the assumption or faith that there is a Spirit, a Mind, a God such as is the object of faith 'in the half-naïve creed of the churches.' [1]

But if the religions of the world are incapable of providing the moral authority and the moral sanction of which we are in search, fortunately there are 'ethical theories which arise independently of religion from reflection on the experience of human life,' [2] *e.g.* the ethics of Confucius and the doctrine of Mencius. Above all, there is the Platonic and the Aristotelian development of the Socratic doctrine of the true 'good' for the individual. Even still more important, for the development of a theory of morals independent of religion, is the growth of modern ethics which aim at shewing that morality is rational, and, as and because rational, possesses authority and constitutes an obligation. Mr. Hobhouse is too much of a philosopher to separate, as Dr. Westermarck does, thought from feeling; on the contrary, the rationality of morals means for him simply that morality is 'a coherent whole of thought and feeling,' and that as rational—and, therefore, obligatory—it determines 'the relation of each individual to the society of which he is a member.' [3]

Now, this conclusion that the value of the individual depends on his worth to society, that as a means to social ends he has value, and as an end in himself has none, is, from the point of view of society, satisfactory enough. But if we are to believe that what is required by the interests of society is the only thing which it is rational for the individual to aim at, we must have some reason for so believing. And thus far Mr. Hobhouse has given us no reason for believing that it is either obligatory or rational for the individual to be treated as having no interests of his own, and as being always a means and never himself an end. Still, we might be content not to insist pedantically on this; we might admit that it was reasonable enough for the individual to regard, or to try to regard, himself always as

[1] *Ibid.* ii. 284. [2] *Ibid.* ii. p. vi. [3] *Ibid.* ii. p. vi.

Digitized by Google

a means to the ends of society, if it were proved that the real, ultimate, interests of the individual simply could not be different from those of society. But Mr. Hobhouse admits that they are different at present: 'the harmony of individual happiness and social development is imperfect, and only approached by degrees as society improves.' [1] According to Mr. Hobhouse, in some, perhaps remote, future, there will be no gap between the good of the individual and the good of the society; but at present there is, and Mr. Hobhouse fails to shew that it is rational to make, or to expect or to accept, the sacrifice of the one to the other, so long as the gap exists.

Thus Mr. Hobhouse never satisfactorily answers the question of what is rational, what is morally and rationally obligatory, for the individual. He fails to shew that the good of the individual and of society harmonize in the life of individuals now living; he does not even claim to do more than argue that there is a tendency to such harmony. That tendency is only a tendency, not a necessity; for its realization constitutes progress, and progress, as Mr. Hobhouse admits, neither has been uninterrupted nor is inevitable. If it is to continue to make way, the individual, as a reasonable creature, must be convinced that it is rational for him to forego his own happiness or even to lay down his own life, in order to strengthen a tendency to a state of society which may never be realized, and of which, if it is ever realized on earth hereafter, he will certainly not be a member. Mr. Hobhouse produces no argument to shew that such action is either rational or obligatory on the individual. He merely makes, tacitly and quite unconsciously, the violent assumption that the individual, as in himself an end, is to count for nothing; that the relation of the individual to society is to be determined solely by the consideration of what is good for others—forgetting that he has himself held up as 'the ideal of conduct,' one to which man is called 'to conform simply because such conduct is best for himself and humanity.' [2]

Mr. Hobhouse fails all the way through to recognize

[1] *Ibid.* p. vii.

[2] *Ibid.* ii. p. 161.

Digitized by Google

that the individual is an end quite as much as society is; and it is only so long as we fail to recognize this that it is possible to take evolution as a philosophy or as a substitute for philosophy. The end of evolution as a process, the result which it is finally to bring about, must come at the termination of the process. The stages which lead up to it, and all they contain or consist of, are but means to 'the harmony of individual happiness and social development.' That is the end of evolution, and individuals who live in any of the stages leading up to it are means to an end which they cannot enjoy. They are not themselves ends; they have no absolute value; their value is that of instruments, to be estimated according to their degree of utility in producing a state of things from which they are, on the terms of the hypothesis, excluded. The whole philosophical problem lies in discovering what is best for the individual as well as for the society to which he belongs—in harmonizing the good of the individual and the good of society. To adjourn the realization of that harmony, as Mr. Hobhouse does, to some remote stage of future society, is to admit that its realization, within the limits of the earthly life of individuals now existing, is impossible. It cannot, therefore, be rational for or obligatory on the individual. Neither is it obligatory on or rational for society in one century to sacrifice itself or to devote itself to forwarding the interests of some other society in some distant future. It was neither the duty nor the business of primitive man to make the earth a comfortable place of residence for us. He was himself an end and not merely a means to our comfort. Doubtless the plough that is now used has been gradually evolved from the digging-stick which he used. But his stick was meant by him for his own use, and not for evolution. The purpose for which he used it was the same as that for which the modern plough is used. The end subserved by the plough, in all stages of its evolution, has been the same for every generation that has used it. To say that it has been put through its evolution in order to produce the plough used by us, or some future improved plough to be used by our remote

Digitized by Google

successors, is obviously absurd; we use it for our own benefit, not for the sake of carrying on its evolution. It is equally absurd to argue that society is organized—still more absurd to say that society *ought* to be organized—not in order that each one of us may realize his end, but solely in order that some future generation may realize their end. Yet that is the absurd conclusion to which we are forced, if we commit the fallacy of assuming that the production of the modern plough—or of modern society—was the end with which the primitive digging-stick was used, or for which primitive society existed. The end or purpose of man is not something which can only be realized at the termination of the evolutionary process. It is not something which can be adequately realized within the limits of this earthly life, or in this world while the individual is still in it—still less when he is no longer in it.

We come back, then, to the question from which Mr. Hobhouse started: 'What form of development is best for the individual?' The answer we give to that question is crucial in deciding what we are to accept as the ultimate basis of morals. And Mr Hobhouse fails to prove that the conduct which he recommends for the individual is best for the individual. That is to say, he fails to solve the philosophic problem of morality.

The real, ultimate, interests of the individual must—we all feel—be identical with those of the society of which he is a member. The philosophic question is: What assumption is it which, being made, will make this belief rational, and, therefore, authoritative and obligatory? We must assume that the society cannot be one purely or solely of this world, and that the existence of the individual who is a member of such a society cannot be limited to this life. And the law of such a society can only be the love of God, in which and by which alone its being is.

F. B. Jevons.

Digitized by Google

ART. V.—THE THEOLOGY OF THE WISDOM LITERATURE.

1. *Encyclopædia Biblica.* Art. 'Wisdom Literature.' By C. H. TOY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (London: A. & C. Black, 1903.)
2. *Job and Solomon: or the Wisdom of the Old Testament.* By T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford, &c., &c. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1887.)
3. *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile,* being the Third Series of American Lectures on the History of Religions. By the same. (New York and London: Putnam, 1898.)
4. *The Theology of the Old Testament.* By the late A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, New College, Edinburgh. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904.)

WE propose in this article to give some account of certain features in the theology of the Wisdom writers of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, and afterwards to consider more generally the value of their contribution towards the development of religious thought. The interest of these writers has been increasingly recognized in recent years. Certainly the appeal of the Scriptures to human nature would be far less complete than it is had their various works not found a place either within or adjacent to the canon of Holy Writ. It is true that for the most part we must not reckon them as among the ranks of the constructive theologians. In the main their fundamental religious ideas are those of the Old Testament generally. The great data of religion are the same for the author of Job as for Isaiah of Babylon, for Koheleth as for the Deuteronomist. The central conceptions of prophecy were a part of their spiritual heritage, and it is within the well-defined limits of the religion of Israel that their activities of thought are conducted. In a more restricted sense, however, their

Digitized by Google

theology is their own. Their general attitude and point of view is distinctive and characteristic of the sages as a class. Their tone is not that of the prophet. Their interests are diverse from those of the lawgiver and of the priest. To this extent it is justifiable to treat their theology as separate. Within the national Church of Israel they are a school apart.

Three features in particular distinguish the Wisdom writers as a class. Of these the most obvious is their concern with 'Wisdom.' Take the term 'Hokmah' in its widest Biblical sense, and it is true to say that it is the subject-matter of which all these authors treat. It is a quality both human and divine. It is personal and impersonal. It is the creative and directing principle of the universe and it is also the shrewd cleverness which secures success. The noblest poetry is not too exalted for the panegyric of wisdom: it inspires also the tritest commonplaces of the market-place and the bazaar. In one or another of its manifold phases these writers all deal with wisdom, though in point of date, literary merit, and their general estimate of life they are widely separated. The problem of the Book of Job is a problem for wisdom. Koheleth had started out in quest of wisdom, and the son of Sirach had made her the object of his youthful prayers. For the typical sage she is the 'principal thing,' and it is round this central conception, so elastic, so suggestive, so peculiarly their own, that this interesting class of Old Testament writers allow their thoughts to range.

A second characteristic of these teachers is that they take the human and universal rather than the national and particularist point of view. They have been called the 'Humanists' of Israel. The 'wisdom' with which they are concerned is not the peculiar possession of their race: Egypt, Edom, and Tyre had Wisdom and Wise Men, though they had nothing equally comparable with the Prophets and the Law. Agur and Lemuel may have lived beyond the borders of Israel Job, like Balaam, was a non-Israelite, while both Koheleth and the son of Sirach have travelled and seen the world. The Wise Men care little for such

Digitized by Google

conceptions as the Covenant and the divine choice of Israel, which were everything to the Prophets. They possess in consequence less intensity of feeling, but they take a wider view of life. Their moral standard is less exacting, their sympathy with the varying phases of human experience is broader. All this has its close relation to their theology. It helps also to account for the fact that no portion of the Bible has such frequent parallelism of thought with the literature of other peoples as these books of wisdom. Their observations on the course of this world and on the ways of God find echoes in the works of all the Moralists. In one passage we are reminded of Lucretius; in another of Carlyle.

There is a third observation to be made on the attitude of these writers. They write as students of life. Their starting-point is not revelation so much as experience. Their tone is more reflective than inspired. Some of the Prophets evidently disliked the Wise Men as a class, and their writings had to struggle for canonicity, not always successfully, against the influence of the legalists. Still, it is an unfair estimate of their purpose to regard them as the rivals or competitors of Prophecy and the Law. Rather they supplement the work of the Prophet and the Lawgiver. They have no visions and few great certainties. They announce no Day of the Lord, no Golden Age, no splendid restoration, no distant Messianic hope. They take human life as they see it. They take the principles of the religion of Israel as they have learned them. And to these they apply, within certain well-defined limits, their powers of observation and reflection. It is not their aim so much to enlarge the spiritual heritage of their race or to elevate the common standard of duty as to discover the principles which underlie the admitted facts of life, and by this discovery to assure themselves and their contemporaries of the truest and wisest attitude for man to adopt towards the world around him and the God above. This spirit of reflection has also its direct relation to the theology of these writers.

To what extent, it may be asked, is a right appreciation of the teaching of the Wisdom Books dependent upon the

Digitized by Google

settlement of questions of criticism and the closely allied questions of authorship and date? Professor Cheyne remarks[1] in connexion with the Book of Job that the necessity for a settlement of textual questions is generally recognized as an essential preliminary for any advance in exegesis. In illustration of this we may observe that the religious significance of the book is wholly altered according as we believe with Dr. A. B. Davidson that the Epilogue was part of the original book and that the author had this conclusion in his mind throughout; or as, on the other hand, we conclude on internal grounds that Job's restoration to prosperity is no integral part of the whole work as originally planned, but only 'a necessary concession to the unspiritual multitude'—in no sense, therefore, capable of furnishing a clue to the central religious conceptions of the author. And, to take a parallel example from the Book of Ecclesiastes, our view of its meaning will differ according as the last six verses are regarded as an addition of later orthodoxy, intended to redeem the book from its offence to piety; or as being, on the other hand, the author's own conclusion, designed to point by contrast the moral and warning of the other portions of his work which are so different in their tone. The value of these books would be raised, undoubtedly, could all such questions find definite settlement, just as their interest would be increased by our attainment of certainty as to the exact historical conditions under which they were composed. Whether the earliest gnomic collection in the Book of Proverbs really reflects the life of the Chosen People in the days of good king Jehoshaphat, whether the Book of Job is really a product of the Exile, whether the pessimism and despair of Koheleth are the outcome in an individual soul of the general hopelessness of the later Persian period, and what exactly were the conditions which made the son of Sirach so happily content with the world just as he found it—these all, no doubt, are questions we would gladly see answered on the ground of conclusive evidence. It is, however, quite impossible, in the present state of our knowledge, to give

[1] Art. 'Job,' *Encyc. Bib.*

Digitized by Google

definite answers to these questions of textual criticism or of historical environment. We fall back upon probabilities, and are grateful for a consensus of experts, wherever one is to be found. Imagination, too, must help us to some extent, as it does in the charming ideal biography prefixed by Dean Plumptre to his edition of Ecclesiastes. Moreover, it is one result of the universalistic standpoint of these writers, to which we have already referred, that the value of the teaching and content of any portion of the Wisdom Literature has a greater intrinsic security and is less affected by questions of date and criticism than is the case, for example, in regard of either the Pentateuch or the Prophetical Books. The meaning of the Book of Job remains much the same whatever view be adopted, on critical grounds, of the speeches of Elihu. The estimate we have formed of the teaching of the son of Sirach is only slightly affected by the discovery, so important on other grounds, of the Hebrew manuscripts.

Within the limits of a single article it will only be possible to point out a few of the chief characteristics of the Theology of the Wisdom Scriptures. For convenience' sake we propose to deal with these under four general heads: the Nature and Being of God; the Divine Order in the World; Last Things; and, finally, Man in relation to God. The principal points of interest in these books—so far, that is, as their definitely religious ideas are concerned—will be found, we believe, to relate themselves naturally with one or another of these central conceptions.

I.

The assertion[1] that the Theology of the Wisdom Literature may claim some independence of other Biblical Theology does not at any rate hold good as regards its presentation of the nature of the Deity. In this respect it takes over the highest ideas of Prophecy and betrays no anxiety to provide itself with other fundamentals. Like other Hebrew teachers the Wise Men never attempt to give any proof of

[1] Duhm, *Theologie der Propheten*, p. 4.

Digitized by Google

the existence of God, nor even to explore the reasons for this cardinal assumption. The Theism of the Proverbs may be cold and colourless, but it is unquestioning and it is consistent. No scepticism in the canonical writings is so audacious as that of Job or so profound as that of Koheleth. Yet both hold that God exists, and this not so much by an effort of faith as because doubt on this point never crosses their minds. For the one, 'God liveth' is the supreme certainty; for the other, 'God is in heaven and thou upon earth' are equally ultimate facts. Moreover, the Theism of these writers is definitely monotheistic. They represent here a later stage of religious thought than the Prophets. Hosea, Isaiah, and even the prophets of the Exile protest that the gods of the heathen are vain and non-existent in the tone of teachers who know that their assertions will be denied. But the Wisdom writers have nothing to say about 'other gods.' There is no need for them to make protests against idolatry. The author of the Book of Wisdom does indeed refer to the idols of Egypt, but not so much to convince his readers of their unreality as to express his contempt for their devotees. By the purity of their monotheism many of these teachers are wholly delivered from the limitations of ethnic religion and particularistic views, while even such less advanced sages as the son of Sirach never revert to the position that Jehovah is so peculiarly the God of Israel that what is not of Israel does not belong to Him. The practice of these writers in regard to the different names for God is in this respect instructive. The distinctively national name 'Jehovah' is used in the Book of Job only in the Prologue and the Epilogue. In Ecclesiastes it is never used at all. It was more natural to these writers to use such terms as 'Elohim,' which suggested no peculiar relations between God and Israel. And while the Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus do, it is true, make frequent use of the term Jehovah, they never press its nationalistic limitations. These, indeed, it had largely lost by the close of the Captivity, and the Jehovah 'whose eyes were in every place,' and of whom it could be said that 'man's spirit was his lamp,' is clearly not on the same

Digitized by Google

plane as Chemosh and Milcom, but is none other than the universal God. In a similar tendency these writers abandon anthropomorphic conceptions. It is true that the Prologue to Job brings us into the court of an almost earthly potentate, and that the poem closes with what is called a theophany. But it was surely a spiritual theophany. Job hardly saw, like Moses, any outward form or shape, and 'mine eye seeth thee' must relate to inward vision. Apart from this, if it be an exception, the Wisdom Literature has no theophanies and it has no miracles. The God of Ecclesiastes is without passions or emotions. The God of the Proverbs rules by general laws without favour and without caprice. These writers have moved some way from the prophetic and narrative books in regarding the Deity as less immediately related to man and to the world. Their conception of God does not cease to be 'economic,' but the Divine Being is raised somewhat further from the details and management of the economy. Their thought has gone some little way in the direction of Transcendence. It is a necessary consequence of this that, while the Wisdom writers have helped to spiritualize the idea of God and to rid it of Israelite limitations, their Divine Being tends inevitably to be somewhat more remote than the God of the Prophets. On the whole He is further from life, and less 'interested,' if the term may be allowed, in the affairs of His servants, than either the God of the second Isaiah or the tender and ever present Deity of the Psalmists. There is less emotion, less enthusiasm in their attitude towards Him in consequence. More is said of the 'fear of the Lord': 'Be thou in the fear of the Lord all the day long'; 'God is in heaven, and thou upon earth: therefore let thy words be few.' These counsels are typical of the Sages' Religion. There is real reverence, but little sense of communion. Their Deity tends to be remote, dispassionate, and even cold, and in view of these characteristics it is important to ask whether He is also a God of Moral Character and a God of Love.

In regard to the first of these two qualities the affirmative answer can be given without hesitation. He favours

Digitized by Google

certain persons for their moral excellence: He dislikes certain courses of action for opposite reasons. Job is confident that, could he but find God, 'the upright might reason with Him.' Even though He have made some things crooked, Koheleth believes Him to be a God of judgement, and this implies a moral nature. His order is a righteous order because in His own Nature He is righteous. Thus even the Sceptical Books never deny that God is a God of moral character, while the other portions of this literature frequently assert it. If God had once been admitted to be a God without moral characteristics, the problem of Job would have been no problem in the real sense of the term at all.

God's Omnipotence, then, for the Wisdom writers, is qualified by His righteousness: it is a further question whether His righteousness is qualified by love. For many of the highest teachers of the Old Testament this is an unquestioned doctrine. Hosea, Isaiah of Babylon, and the Psalmists tell of 'mercy and judgement' without ever finding the two elements incompatible. And, generally speaking, this is also true as regards the non-canonical Wisdom Books, Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon. The son of Sirach regards God as 'full of compassion and mercy': he uses the figure of the good 'shepherd': he speaks in the last chapter of his book from personal experience. So in the Book of Wisdom God is the saviour of all: His 'friendship' is open to all, to which we may add the beautiful saying, 'even if we sin, we are thine.'[1] But in the case of the Canonical Books the question is more difficult. In the Book of Proverbs the word 'Love' is only once used of God. The emotional element in Religion, together with that element in the Divine Nature to which human emotion is the response, remains unemphasized and in abeyance. But what of Job and Ecclesiastes? Is there any love in the Divinity these two books recognize? In Job the blessings of the Epilogue do not touch the view of the Deity in the poem itself. Dr. Cheyne quotes[2] the words of the Jewish scholar Luzzatto: 'The God of Job is

[1] Wisdom xv. 2. [2] *Job and Solomon*, p. 104.

Digitized by Google

not the God of Israel, the gracious one : He is the Almighty and the Righteous, but not the Kind and Faithful one.' To this, however, he dissents, since 'the God of Job would be less than infinitely righteous if He were not also kind.' Delitzsch and Ewald agree in this, and Professor A. B. Davidson's interpretation of the book tends in the same direction. This is the most that can be said for the doctrine of a divine love in Job : the book, it must be remembered, deals mainly with the question of God's justice which had been so fiercely disputed. Koheleth, however, knows nothing of the love of God. His view is so much calmer, more deliberate and more permanent than that of Job, that we are compelled to recognize in this writer a complete scepticism, if not an implied denial, on the point. In his view God orders all, gives all, sees all : He may be offended or be pleased : the surest wisdom is to fear Him. But there is no hint of any more intimate relationship between the human and the divine.

II.

Biblical Theology is little inclined to speculate upon the nature and attributes of the Deity in His own absolute and unrelated existence, and prefers rather to consider His self-revelation in the various phases of the order of the world. What God has done is in this way for all Hebrew religious philosophy the index to what God is. The Wisdom writers are among the poets of the Bible, and they have the poet's eye and the poet's thought for the beauty and the majesty of the world of Nature. It has been well said that they belong to the class of 'those poet-theologians from whom we English have learned so much.' Now, these writers recognize an order in Nature. They do not, indeed, realize the minute exactitude and the rigid sequence of natural laws after the manner of modern science. But their grasp of the truth is sufficiently strong for them to discern in Nature a revelation of the Divine will. And they know no distinction between natural and revealed religion, for this best of reasons—that Nature is a revelation.

Digitized by Google

It has been argued that Greece found the divine in what is harmonious and lucid: Hebraism in what is monstrous and obscure.[1] But the antithesis may easily be pressed too far. The fixed boundaries of the deep, the appointed ordinances of the heavens, the regularity of the processes of Nature, the determining influence of creative wisdom in the cosmogony of the Proverbs, are all instances of the early conceptions of a cosmic order. Ecclesiastes even, though he knows nothing of any 'increasing purpose' and directly denies development, still discovers fixed principles in the physical world. Everything has its season and its time. The winds and the rivers have their appointed circuits. The universe has no progress, no evolution: it is a series of cycles. But it is not chance, it is not chaos—it is the work of God who doeth all. And other writers bear out this idea. The forces of Nature discharge their tasks in ceaseless obedience to the Divine will; each element has its ordained use; all things 'consist' by the Word of God, and at the basis of phenomena is a conscious Power which holds all things together. Occasionally there emerges the further suggestion of certain moral affinities in Nature. Some winds are created for vengeance: fire and hail, tooth of beast and adder's fang are instruments for the destruction of the ungodly. History affords evidence of the sympathy of the universe with righteousness.[2]

This frank claim that the natural world is a factor in the moral and spiritual processes of Divine Government should be compared with the teaching of the Prophets as to the regeneration of Nature for which they look in the Messianic Age, and with St. Paul's wonderful account of the spiritual purpose and tendency of Nature in the Epistle to the Romans.

Probably the most interesting part of the Wisdom Theology is that which deals with the Divine Order in its relation to the moral life of Man. It was the established doctrine that the Judge of all the Earth must do right, and

[1] Renan, *Livre de Job*, p. lxxvi.

[2] Wisdom xvi. 17. 'For the Cosmos is a fighter for the righteous. The passage is a notable one.

Digitized by Google

that man can know the righteousness of His doings. This amounted to the belief that it was of the very essence of God's government that He should reward righteousness and punish its opposite. The prosperity of those who pleased Him, and, its obvious correlative, the sufferings of those who did not, thus became a truth for which all devout and orthodox Israelites expected, at least in pre-exilic days, to find indisputable evidence in the facts of life. So long as the nation remained the spiritual unit, this was never an impossible belief. The prosperity that was the reward of national righteousness would come at a later day, if it did not come at once. It was promised to Israel, not to particular Israelites. Conversely, the sins for which the fathers did not suffer themselves would be visited upon their children. Now, this theory of a moral order which completely realized itself in this world was transferred from the nation as a whole to the individual so soon as the downfall of the State, and, still more, the evident moral distinctions within it, made the community no longer the most natural unit for the purposes of religious thought. Within the range of a single life's experience God's order must be manifest: the good man must gain by his goodness, the bad man suffer for his wrong. This was orthodoxy, and the orthodox demanded without hesitation that the facts of life should accord with the theory. Nothing is more surprising in the religious thought of the Bible than the pertinacity with which this belief held its ground. It is accepted without question in the Proverbs: Job's three friends assert it from their several standpoints: Koheleth is convinced of its truth, though he has seen exceptions to it. The son of Sirach gives it an entire adherence. It survived, as we know, till the days of the Gospel: a massacre of Galilean pilgrims or the fall of a tower in Siloam was held to be evidence of the sinfulness of those who thereby lost their lives.[1] This doctrine of a moral order in the world, visible as regards the individual within the limits of a single life's duration, was held by all the orthodox sages throughout the whole of the reflective period of Jewish

[1] Cf. also St. John ix. 1, 2.

Digitized by Google

thought. It was asserted with robust faith and survived an abundance of contrary instances.

There were some, however, who realized the inherent difficulties of the doctrine. The Psalmists and Jeremiah were greatly perplexed by the prosperity of the wicked. The common solution was to affirm that such prosperity was shortlived, or, when this proved inadequate, to hazard the further theory that the penalty came in the next generation. This, of course, on any individualistic assumptions, ceased to justify the ways of God at all. There is a fine and legitimate contempt in the words with which Job dismisses this retrospective righteousness.[1] The difficulty was really untouched by either of these insufficient explanations. And the central interest of the Book of Job, itself the central and most important book of all the Wisdom Literature, is this difficulty of Faith. Job is a righteous man; yet Job is visited with an unusual severity of suffering. The hero does not claim that he is sinless. He is ready to admit that in the common frailty of human nature he has had faults and iniquities which need the Divine pardon. But he is conscious of no exceptional wickedness, and in language more bold and passionate than any other speaker in the Bible ever uses towards God, he asserts that his sufferings are wholly out of proportion to his deserts. The hero's part in the poem is thus a sustained arraignment of the Divine justice. His well-meaning, orthodox, yet inadequate comforters can only apply the recognized solution to his particular case, and assert that his sufferings must be evidence of exceptional sin. These are the two theological positions of the central part of the book. The antithesis between the two grows more and more defined at each fresh stage of the controversy. At the end we are left with the traditional and the sceptical positions, one over against the other in fully developed antagonism, no single effective approach towards reconciliation having been made on either side. At length the Almighty answers Job out

[1] 'Ye say, God layeth up his (*sc.* the wicked man's) iniquity for his children.

Let Him recompense it unto himself, that he may know it.'—xxi. 19.

Digitized by Google

of the whirlwind, but in the full sense of the term He does not answer His servant at all. The argument of these cc. xxxviii.-xli., singularly beautiful as they are from a literary point of view, is only that man must accept moral mysteries, as he accepts mysteries in Nature, and must not seek to understand. Job is silenced and submits. He has not seen the answer to his problem, he has only seen that God's ways are too vast for man to comprehend. The question, therefore, is left unsolved. At the close of the poem we are without any clear and sufficient light upon the central difficulty of its thought. The book raises a problem to which it finds no effective answer, though this interpretation of it is quite consistent with the admissions that Job never wholly loses his faith, that his sufferings are meant to test his righteousness, that they have an educative value, that the book has, secondarily, a national significance, and that in the Epilogue the orthodox position is reasserted, and the hero compensated by flocks and children and rings of gold. All these subsidiary lines of interpretation leave the central problem of the poem still without any complete solution.

The Book of Job must, however, be estimated not on the basis of its permanent and positive theological teaching, but in relation to the development of Hebrew religious philosophy. So regarded, its result is a negative one, but it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of its negation as a preliminary to the reception of a wider and higher truth. The sufferings of the righteous man remain at the end of the book unexplained: Job's friends have retired: Job is silent: the Almighty has only asserted that other things also are inexplicable. But the traditional theory has, at any rate, been discredited. It is inadequate to the task of presenting the world as a moral order. Even though the duration of the individual life be doubled, there is not space within these temporal limits for the dispensations of the Eternal Providence to manifest their inherent righteousness and to make their ultimate purpose for the individual spirit clear.

This necessity for enlarging the area of the domain within which the solution of the problem may be sought

Digitized by Google

has been frequently recognized. The opinions of one or two well-known interpreters of the Book of Job may be quoted with advantage. Delitzsch terms it 'an inadequate theodicy.' Ewald asserts that 'the thought of the book has no validity whatever, if it cannot find the basis of its certainty in the immortality of the soul.' Professor Davidson, who lays less stress on the book's insufficiencies, still admits that 'no solution of Job's problem is vouchsafed,' and that 'Job's results, as given in the body of the book, are wholly negative.' And Renan's words with regard to another book of the Wisdom Literature apply in principle to Job: 'Il est clair que les impénétrables obscurités dont le gouvernement du monde est entouré aux yeux de notre auteur seraient dissipées si Cohelet avait la moindre notion d'une vie à venir.' Are there, then, any hints in Job and the other books of this literature of 'larger hope' in the light of which the contradictions of human experience in this world shall be at any rate not final? This brings us to a new division of our subject—the position of the writers as regards the 'Last Things.'

III.

In matters of Eschatology the authors of the Wisdom Literature take in the main the same standpoint as the Old Testament generally. Death is never annihilation: it is the passage of the human personality from one state of existence to another—with death man only ceases to be in the sense that he ceases to have any part or lot in the life of the world. The dead are 'gathered unto their own people,' they 'go hence,' 'they go the way of all the earth.' The place of their after-existence is Sheol, the dim hollow underworld, the meeting-place of all the departed, where life is robbed of all that gives it colour and meaning and value in this present world. It is a land of forgetfulness, with no moral distinctions and no relics of human interest, where the soul is even deprived of all fellowship with God. Is this view ever modified in the Wisdom Books? Do their authors ever hint at

Digitized by Google

or teach any other view of the life beyond? Does anything worth calling Immortality ever come within their scope?

In attempting to give the outlines of the answer to this question the several books must be considered separately. The Proverbs, more concerned as they are with this life than with any unseen future, shew that the collectors of gnomic wisdom did not, as a rule, feel any occasion to question current doctrine in regard to the end of life. Sheol is the 'pit,' swallowing up the lives of men, insatiable in its capacities, vast in its dim recesses which are only penetrable to the eyes of God. This is the common Old Testament view. But possibly even here there are exceptions. It is said of the strange woman that 'her quests are in the depths of Sheol.' When the several passages bearing on this subject are put together, they appear to imply more than that the immoral man finds his way to Sheol more quickly than the man of virtue. Some relation of consequence seems to be suggested between man's condition in Sheol and Sin. There may be here an early phase of the doctrine of Future Retribution, a suggestion—no more—that men meet in the other world with the consequences of their deeds in this. Conversely, even though Proverbs xv. 24 and xxiii. 14 express nothing more than current ideas, the saying that 'the righteous hath hope in his death' is admitted by Professor Toy[1]—a commentator not predisposed to discover the New Testament in the Old—to be a clear reference to Immortality, unless the reading is erroneous. Koheleth has little to add on the side of Hope. He reasserts the current view—there is 'one event,' 'one place' for all. He admits, however, the wider possibility when he asks 'Who knoweth the spirit of man whether it goeth upward?' and almost asserts it in saying 'The spirit shall return unto God who gave it.' Here and there, too, are words which may suggest a Future Retribution. His outlook is sceptical, cynical, but at least not indifferent. The son of Sirach has been recognized as an exponent of incipient Sadduceeism. His normal view of the 'Last Things' is to be found in such words as these: 'The son of man is not immortal'; 'the covenant

[1] *Commentary on Proverbs xiv. 32.*

Digitized by Google

of the grave is not shewed to thee'; there is no 'inquisition of life' there, 'no luxury,' no praise of the Most High. The only hereafter a man can hope for is in the recollection of later generations, and the well-known chapters in praise of famous men gain significance when we remember the writer's standpoint. The exceptions, if any, to this general teaching are rare. But he does make reference to Enoch's translation. He accepts the tradition which credited Samuel and Elijah with a continued agency in this world after death. He does not omit the story of Elijah raising a dead man, and alike for the Judges and the twelve Prophets he prays that 'their bones may flourish out of their place.' The strange words, 'we also shall surely live,' would be most important if the text were not very doubtful.

There are two important passages in the Book of Job which are as momentary and passing gleams of brighter and wider hopes. They do not afford Job any solution for his problem, because he can only regard them as ideas of glorious significance but without any reliable guarantee. Of these the one is chapter xiv. 10–15.

> 'All the days of my warfare would I wait
> Till my release should come.
> Thou shouldest call and I would answer thee:
> Thou wouldest have a desire to the work of thine hands.

He has contemplated the possibility of man being aroused out of the sleep-life of Sheol. But he repudiates the conception: he dare not believe it. Then he passes on to express, in the language of a prayer which does not expect to be fulfilled, his longing that this might have been true, and that to his own question 'If a man die shall he live again?' the affirmative answer had been possible. A religious conception must be clearly grasped before it can be definitely denied. Job is lingering over a hope too good to be true, but it is important to observe how clearly the essentials of the doctrine of Immortality are present to his mind. Here is the sleep of an intermediate state: here is a rising or waking from the grave: here, too, is the most indispensable of all the elements in the wider hope, the

Digitized by Google

thought of an ultimate reunion of the personal soul with God. The sufferer falls back upon his sorrows, but he has seen the further country, though himself, indeed, he may not enter in. The other passage is the well-known one beginning

'I know that my redeemer (vindicator) liveth.'[1]

So much has been said about these difficult, disputed, and yet splendid words that we only propose to point out again how, according to their most commonly accepted interpretation, the mind of Job is led on from the prayer for an inscription that should attest his innocence after his death, to the conviction that God, as his Vindicator, shall indeed accomplish this great acquittal for him, and then, since his deliverance would be incomplete if he did not know it himself, to the further thought of his own personal share in this ultimate justification. Of these words of daring hopefulness Professor Davidson writes: 'I do not know but that to Job's mind all the religious essentials were present which we associate with the future life.'[2] The author of the poem did not venture to develop his own suggestion. But once, at any rate, not so much by his own inward faith as by the stress and trend of the problem he has raised—following, one might say, like the Platonic Socrates, 'whither the argument leads'—he has revealed to us the lines along which alone a reconciliation for the contradictions of this present world must be found. The belief in a moral order so complete that it does not even disregard the interests of the individual and the demands of the human spirit, can only commend itself to the dispassionate judgement of our reason on the assumption that its manifestation in the temporal sphere is only partial and incomplete. In the perfect whole the antinomies may be adjusted and the pattern at which the great weaver is working grow clear in a harmony of colouring not yet discernible. Within the limits of that portion of Scripture with which this article is concerned, this wider view is only definitely asserted in the Book of Wisdom, upon the theology of which Greek

[1] Job xix. 25. [2] *Old Testament Theology*, p. 495.

Digitized by Google

thought has exerted an evident influence. For this more hopeful writer, on whose work we would so gladly have seen a chapter in Professor Cheyne's book, Immortality is a great conviction. 'God made not death.' 'The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God.' Their 'little chastening' is but the preparation for their 'great good.' Death, indeed, is deliverance since God made man in his own image for incorruption, and in the after life men receive the wages of holiness and the prize that is laid up for 'blameless souls.' This is a very distinct advance:

'Via prima salutis
. . . Graia pandetur ab urbe.'

To conclude our reference to the 'Last Things,' as these Wisdom writers viewed them, it is to be observed that none of these five books is wholly devoid of all suggestion of Immortality. Even in the most sceptical of them the wider hope is now and again suggested as a possibility. Here, as in the Psalms, the movement of the writer's mind seems to carry him at times beyond the limits of the doctrine he had consciously realized. He hints, in spite of himself, at convictions destined only in later years to grow clear and strong.

And these occasional statements are of all the greater interest in that, except in the Book of Wisdom, they are never made as glorious announcements with any consciousness of their importance. These writers have received no special revelation. They have no gospel to announce. They are concerned with the present, and in some cases much perplexed by it. No Theology and no Metaphysic has shewn them the way to great convictions. It is just the problems of Human Experience which seem to assume larger proportions as the Wise Men handle them. So they are drawn beyond the beaten tracks, upon the first stages of the pathway destined to lead to 'those mighty hopes which make us men.'

IV.

Much might be said on the treatment of the subject of Man in relation to God in the Wisdom Literature. Within

Digitized by Google

the limits of this article we can do no more than suggest one or two main lines for its consideration. These writers accept the cardinal principle of Genesis ii. 7. 'God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.' So his composite nature has a double source. Even Koheleth is never led by his doubt as to man's destiny into any uncertainty as to his origin. Man is 'an image of God's own proper being.' Yet he is a subject rather than a son, and God a Sovereign rather than a Father. The Wisdom Books fall here below the level of Hosea or Deuteronomy. They know little of the piety and personal communion which finds such beautiful and intense expression in the Psalter. The attitude they love best to prescribe for man is the 'Fear of the Lord.' This fear, indeed, never quite sinks into the craven dread of a slave before an irresponsible tyrant, but neither does it ever quite rise to that fear of grieving the Divine Spirit which is not even cast out by perfect love because it is indistinguishable from it. It is sometimes true reverence; it is sometimes prudent calculation; it is 'the foundation of wisdom.' At its best it is the awe which is a direct antithesis to the 'insolence,' the ὕβρις, of the Greeks. Of the wisdom which builds up the conduct of life upon this foundation, it must be observed that it is essentially a practical quality, and that the Wise Men frequently express profound distrust of the speculative faculties and of thought for thought's sake. No advocacy of the contemplative life would ever have stirred them from this position. In that lack of the purely intellectual interest which is so marked a trait in the Semitic disposition, they abandon the higher aims of human thought as altogether out of range, and limit the functions of 'Godlike reason' to the apprehension of the immediate and practical conditions of man's welfare. Such wisdom, indeed, within its limits was an excellent thing. All moral excellencies appear to coexist with her, and the son of Sirach has noble words to say of her influence as seen in the concord of brethren, in friendship, or in the best happiness of married life. There were Labour Members in the society he knew, and, scribe

Digitized by Google

as he was, his estimate of the value of the worker does him credit: 'each becometh wise in his own work'; 'in the handiwork of their craft is their prayer.'

The most serious criticism of this practical wisdom is that, as a basis of morality, it lacks disinterestedness. It is utilitarian, and, at bottom, selfish, advocating right conduct because it promises certain advantages. It seems to share the conviction of Job's adversary, 'Doth man serve God for naught?' But we can hardly expect these wise men to abandon the almost axiomatic principle of the Old Testament that God rewards His servants, or to rise to the modern idea of a duty which will give no reason for its imperatives. Moreover, there is a right and high self-interest.

V.

We shall conclude this article by attempting a brief estimate of the services which the Wisdom writers rendered first to the life and thought of their own times, and secondly to the wider development of Religious Belief, and especially in so far as they prepared the way for Christianity.

In regard to the religious life of Israel these teachers corrected or attempted to correct the tendency to exclusive nationalism. During the course of the six centuries which separate the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar from the Birth of Christ, and which form the Middle Age of Biblical History, the sense of his separation from other peoples was strong in the Israelite. The race had been divinely chosen. The purpose of God for the Jew was imperilled when he lost his national identity. He might not forget Jerusalem in Babylon, nor share the worship of the Samaritan, nor marry the woman of alien blood, nor tolerate the foreigner in his shrine. Without this national isolation the Jew could never have discharged his appointed office. But the dangers of every phase of narrow nationalism are well known. Patriotism is not the absolute virtue. The spiritual prerogatives of the Hebrew needed the complement of a wider theology. It was the work of the wise more than of any other school of masters

Digitized by Google

in Israel to mitigate the antagonisms of national feeling and to tone down the exclusiveness of Judaism by their more human teaching. By their very silence on such points as the special relation of Jehovah to Israel, by their study of the universal problems, by their personal experience of the world, often more wide than deep, by their receptivity to Gentile influence, by their general temper, more quiet and genial in many cases than that of either the Prophets or the Priests, and by their clear conception of one God over all, these teachers exerted a generous, broadening, humanizing influence upon their contemporaries, which served in some measure to correct the spiritual dangers which are always incurred when either a people or a community or an individual claims, in order to discharge their mission, a peculiar exemption from the common movement of the world at large.

Moreover, these teachers helped to mitigate the evils of rigid legalism. The religion of Israel was conserved in the external shell or form of Ritual, Ordinances, and Law which were the special creation of the priestly schools and of which some counterpart seems to be necessary to all religions in order to preserve their continuity of existence. In the Rabbis' phrase this was the 'hedge' around the shrine. The necessity for some such protection for the religious gift of the race is evident, especially when the scanty inspiration of the post-exilic period is borne in mind. But these protective elements involve the risk of externalism, and a distinctive ministry of the Wisdom Theology was that it helped to correct this tendency. The period has been called the period of the Hagiocracy, and when the day of the Hebrew kings was over the priests' opportunity had arrived. The experience of history as to the tendencies of such epochs has been consistently the same. They involve the dangers of a caste system: they lead to a reliance on ceremonies and form: they generate a traditional conservatism, with vested interests in spiritual things, and they elaborate a cultus often so inimical to human interests that Religion is divorced from actual life. This danger arose in Israel when after the Exile the Jew came to possess a Law and

Digitized by Google

Priesthood, a Temple worship, an elaboration of ceremony, a sanctity of things and times and persons such as he had not previously known. The service of the Wise Men was to keep alive in the heart of the race other spiritual interests, wherein lay the remedy or prophylactic against mere legalism. They called men back to experience and facts. By their readiness to hold converse with their neighbours in the gate, by their demand that observances shall not be separate from conduct, by their clear sanity of teaching scornful alike of all mere theories and all casuistical pleas, above all by their honest conviction that the whole of life for man stands in a definite relationship to God, these wise masters in Israel helped to prevent or retard that division between religious forms and ethical character which is the surest token that any given race or Church or person is on the highway of spiritual decline.

The Wisdom Literature contributes also a positive element of Philosophy, Criticism, and Reflection. The greatest teachers of the Bible find it more natural to express truth than to discover or discuss it. This is almost the very conception of the Prophet. The Psalmists do the same with more of emotion and less of vision. The strength of the message of the Old Testament lies in its vivid, intuitive apprehension of the Divine Will. To some extent this implies the suppression or at least the disuse of the inquiring, reasoning, criticizing faculties of man's nature. Ultimately there can be no antagonism between Revelation and Inquiry, but practically the man who is the recipient of a Revelation is not the man who seeks for knowledge by deliberate logical methods. Yet for a complete religion, in which God may be loved with mind and soul alike, the combination of these two processes is essential. Truth may not only be given: it must also be grasped. Spiritual movements involve also movements that are intellectual. The wise men of Israel represent this necessary element of discussion, criticism, reflection, reason, philosophy, within the religion of their race. The gnomic wisdom of the Proverbs is the search for an intelligible moral order. Job is the critic of tradition, the champion of experience against theory.

Digitized by Google

Koheleth is the sceptic who wishes to believe, but will not blind himself in order to make Faith's venture easy. The Sapiential Psalms spring from different phases of the same spirit. In each case there is mind at work; thought predominates over emotion (even in Job it is more important) and over vision. Alone, without the greater ministry of the Prophet, the Lawgiver and the Psalmist, the wise would have had no data for their work, and they could themselves have created no religion: the critic never does. But they contributed to the religion of their race this important element of critical reflection, and claimed, in such manner as their age allowed, that the intellect also has its function in uniting man to God.

Finally, what of their wider service in preparing the way for Christianity? All destructive criticism acquires a positive character when it is seen to prepare the ground for a later and worthier construction. The Temple of Truth has to be rebuilt from time to time, but the glory of the 'latter house,' when fully apprehended, must bring no tears to the eyes of those who remember the earlier, unless the Church's belief in spiritual progress be at bottom a delusion. Now, the greatest of the Wisdom writers were undoubtedly destructive critics. To this class belong both Job and the author of Ecclesiastes. They repudiate current beliefs, the one denying the justice of the world's order, the other the possibility of discovering here that which will satisfy the soul of man. Neither of them even approaches the constructive standpoint nor comes within measurable distance of the fuller truth. Nevertheless they and the other numerous unknown teachers who shared their negative convictions rendered this service to later religion. They made the defects of the traditional views apparent. Their denials were the prelude to assertions. And when this thankless negative office of the sceptics is brought into its historical relationships and connected with the lost hopes of the Captivity, with the decline of Israel's national greatness, with the early doctrine of the Resurrection as taught in Daniel, with Hellenic influences in regard of Immortality, with the better elements of the teaching of the Pharisees,

Digitized by Google

and, finally, with the full 'Christianity' of the Lord Himself—only then does the true value of Job's protests and of Koheleth's pessimism stand clear. It is a far distance from Job and Solomon to the Master's teaching on eternal life or to Saint Paul's conceptions of the coming of 'that which is perfect' and of the 'house not made with hands.' But there is a real doctrinal lineage between them. The Wisdom movement was an early stage in the development of that spiritual religion which had its perfect outcome in the purest doctrines of the New Testament. Indirectly and by way of preparation these teachers help to build the shrine of the eternal whose only recognized office is the 'removing of those things that are shaken.'

In the doctrine of the 'Hokmah' school the personified Divine Wisdom bears a generally recognized resemblance to the 'Word' Who was made flesh at the Incarnation. It may be true that 'the august figure of the creative wisdom is not referred to in the New Testament and plays little part in later Jewish thought.' Possibly there is no direct consciousness in the Pauline and Johannine writings of the degree to which their Christological doctrine had been foreshadowed by the Old Testament account of the Divine Wisdom. In later Christian teachers, however, as for example in Clement of Alexandria, the doctrine of Wisdom is expressly recognized as an anticipation of the office of the Logos-Christ. The parallel, indeed, whether consciously recognized or not, is very close. In the high conception of One who is at once a Person and a Power without the restrictions of Personality, who was the offspring of Absolute Deity, who was with God in the beginning of the ways in which He is known to man, who is seated with Him on the throne as his Assessor, who is the image, effulgence, manifestation of His Nature, whose good will towards man is evident and known, and who can enter into the closest relationships alike with the religious community and with the individual soul—in such a figure it is indeed hard not to discern an anticipation of the characteristic features of Him Who was the Word of God. Thus many of the highest offices of the Christ—His revelation of the Divine Will, His

Digitized by Google

instruction of humanity, His mediatorial work as being Himself both human and divine, His relation to and embodiment in the Church, His will for man's welfare, His manifestation of the nature of the Unseen God—may all be recognized as unconsciously prophesied by the ancient doctors of Hebrew lore in their portrayal of the supramundane Wisdom. Such portrayal becomes almost portraiture when we recall Saint Paul's recognition of Christ as the 'Wisdom of God.'

Again, it is generally recognized that the religion of Jesus of Nazareth is concerned primarily with the individual. 'The care of Christianity,' said Bishop Warburton, 'is for particulars.' 'The religious individualism of the Gospel is, and must remain for all time, the true salt of the earth,' says a more modern writer. The very presupposition of the Christian communion, in which alone the individual fully realizes himself, is that every member of the race has an intrinsic and potential spiritual worth. Now, the Wise Men did not originate any movement in the direction of religious individualism. This is to be seen elsewhere, in the doctrine of Ezekiel, in the personal experience of Jeremiah, in the relation so abundantly implied in the Psalms between the soul and God. The 'Servant of the Lord' and the speaker in such Psalms as the 'De profundis' are probably persons as well as the personified community. The influence of the Sages is in line with all this. They rest upon no theory of a chosen race; they make no direct reference to the nation's sufferings; they have no vision of a great national future; their whole interest is human rather than Israelite, and their discussion of both the practical and speculative problems of life is always upon the personal scale. So concerned with man and his individual experiences these wise men are the representatives of a line of Hebrew thought which was unconsciously preparatory to the advent of that true Master in Israel, who did not hesitate to assert that a little child had value in the eyes of God, that the real kingdom was in the domain of personal experience within us, that the divine judgement was a judgement of individual lives and

Digitized by Google

works, and that the hope of personal Immortality was among the glorious yet reasonable convictions of the Faith that was to bear His name.

The Book of Job is the highest product of the Old Testament wisdom. And last among the preparatory services of the Hokmah theology to Christianity it will be appropriate to mention the foreshadowing of the life and Person of the Saviour in the character and fortunes of the central figure of the book. The comparison between the sufferings of Job and the sufferings of our Lord is made, possibly, by Saint James in his Epistle. The reading of the Book of Job during Holy Week in the churches of Origen's day is a further recognition of the parallel. Delitzsch takes it almost as a principle of interpretation that the 'real contents of the Book of Job is the mystery of the cross.' And while we must admit that older methods of interpretation were unduly prone to discover in the Old Testament types and conscious anticipations of the central Personality of the New, still there is a true contribution towards the doctrine of Christ in the theology of the Book of Job. As Professor Cheyne is concerned to write with some emphasis, 'the Book of Job *is* theological.'[1] Its principal assertion is that suffering in this life may be the destiny of the truest and noblest of the servants of God. On a national scale this had been already taught by the trials of the Captivity. Jeremiah's inward experience was a supreme evidence of this truth. The character of the Servant of the Lord is its fullest and fairest expression within the Old Testament limits. But the truth is nowhere asserted with more deliberate intention, nor in the face of greater difficulties, nor with clearer knowledge that all current opinion is against it, than in the Book of Job. The assertion of this doctrine is of all the greater value because the explanations of it are so evidently wanting. The strange partnership of Sorrow with Goodness is taught ere any insight into the true reason for it had yet arrived. So Job in his sufferings, in bearing that which is not the outcome of his own deeds, in his solitary pain among friends who cannot understand

[1] *Job and Solomon*, p. 102.

Digitized by Google

him, in his resolute consciousness of his own integrity, in his occasional moments of conviction that the God who lays this burden on him is still his friend, and finally in his silence and submission under this mysterious and appointed trial, is so far a true prophet and partaker of the sufferings of the Christ. But so far only, and not completely, we miss indeed the sustaining consciousness of God as ever with him; we miss the element of sacrifice for others' good; we miss the great and cheering hope of an ultimate success. But these defects in the earlier story not only throw into stronger relief the full doctrine of Christianity. They also compel a clearer recognition of the central assertion of Job's theology, the entire compatibility of Righteousness with Pain. So the Eastern patriarch in his days of calamity is a true representative of the struggles of the human spirit towards the ideal to be afterwards revealed in the Person of Him who was the Man of Sorrows, in whom men found no fault, for whose pains Humanity has known no parallels, and who while He guides His followers along all the many several roads which meet finally in the Kingdom, seems never to lead them with fuller certainty of their destination than when they follow Him along the royal road of His own most holy cross.

The Wisdom of the Hebrews was not the greatest of the spiritual products of the race. It never rose to the heights of Prophecy. Its full development was in the Middle Period when great things and great men were of the past. It often raised questions for which it could find no certain answer. It supplemented, reflected, interpreted, but it rarely possessed the power to create. It often lacked inspiration, and it never attained to so full a conviction of its own mission as the 'divine philosophy' of Greece. It could never claim to be either the most natural or the most adequate expression of the genius of the Semitic peoples, nor did it always manifest the qualities of the wisdom which cometh from above. Yet, at its best, this wisdom was a veritable Charisma—a true gift of God. Were its literature omitted from our Scriptures they would be the poorer for the loss. In rank and line with

Digitized by Google

the ideal Prophet, the ideal King, and the ideal Priest, the ideal Sage may also claim his place. Moreover, he has other and wider affinities than these. Down the ages of human history, and through all varieties of Revelation, Time and Race, he owns a certain spiritual kinship with all those greater or lesser teachers of the world of whom, when we estimate their lives and work, we may say that they sought honestly for God and Truth: that they tried to discern the real principles of life: that they strove to interpret Nature: that they struggled against sombre facts for Faith: and that they endeavoured to justify the ways of God to men. Whenever we come into close contact with members of this goodly company we understand something of the meaning of Lucretius when he wrote:

> 'Deus ille fuit, Deus, inclute Memmi,
> Qui princeps vitae rationem invenit eam, quae
> Nunc appellatur sapientia':

or the meaning of St. Paul's suggestive phrase, 'The manifold (πολυποίκιλος) wisdom of God': or the meaning of the Master when he said, 'Wisdom is justified of all her children.'

Digitized by Google

ART. VI.—THE UNPOPULARITY OF THE ABBEYS.

1. *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii S. Albani* a THOMA WALSINGHAM regnante Ricardo secundo eiusdem ecclesiae praecentore compilata. Edited by H. T. RILEY. 'Rolls Series.' Three volumes. (London: Longmans, 1867.)
2. THOMAE WALSINGHAM quondam monachi S. Albani *Historia Anglicana* (1272–1422). Edited by H. T. RILEY. 'Rolls Series.' Two volumes. (London: Longmans, 1863–4.)

Encyclopaedia Britannica. Vol. XVI. Art. 'Monachism.' By the Rev. R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L. Ninth Edition. (Edinburgh: A. & C. Black, 1883.)

And other works.

THE vividly drawn picture in a recent novel by Mr. R. H. Benson [1] has roused the sympathies of many of his readers for the great and imposing monastic institutions which fell at the word of Henry VIII., and the original objects of which were noble enough to deserve a nobler fate. Possibly it is not surprising that legends of various kinds have been invented to account for their disappearance into the limbo of the past, leaving behind them such monuments as Winchester and Canterbury Cathedrals and St. Albans Abbey, to say nothing of the abbey and priory churches, and romantic ruins which speckle the map of England. For some time the field was held by the legend that they were tenanted by lazy monks who waxed fat on the offerings made by a superstitious population, and were swept away by the righteous indignation of a Protestant people revolted at their immorality; then came the reaction which brought about the notion that they were all full of saintly men whom wicked Protestants, hating their religion, turned out to starve. As a matter of fact, Protestantism, good or bad, had little to do with their downfall, except so far as it 'unchurched' the general atmosphere of thought; and most of the accusations of immorality seem to have been trumped

[1] *The King's Achievement.* By Robert Hugh Benson. (Pitman, 1905.)

Digitized by Google

up to impress the 'man in the street'; but England doubtless hailed as a national benefit the dissolution of the monasteries, and the object of this article is to give a reason for the fact.

It is as well before dealing with the decay of the monasteries to look at their rise. It is not too much to say that they were the chief means which brought about the beginnings of the new civilization of Europe after the fall of the old Roman order. In Italy, Spain, France, Germany, Austria and England the profession of the warrior was the only one honoured, and the highborn fighter who knew how to make his hand keep his head the only aristocrat. All honest labour on the kindly earth was committed to the serfage, and the serf and his womankind had no rights to speak of. Into this condition of society the monastic foundations brought a new social as well as a new religious idea. The great robber-castles, the survival of which in Germany Charlotte Yonge describes in the *Dove in the Eagle's Nest*, and which were almost universal in every country in Western Europe at some period between the sixth and twelfth centuries, beheld rising among them, buildings the inmates of which lived without thought of fighting; the downtrodden serfs, dealt with like dogs by their rough masters, found neighbours who treated them kindly, gave alms to them when hungry, and encouraged their literary powers as Hilda did for Cædmon. Men who through sickness or accident or incapacity for pushing their way in the brutal world had failed in life, or women, widowed or deserted, might there find a safe and peaceful home. Round the abbeys were to be found the greenest meads, the richest harvest fields, the least ruinous villages of poor huts; for under the Benedictine system, as among the Lauras of the Thebaid, labour was the rule of life alike for lord or serf. The Benedictine Rule was the foundation of all the various Rules of other monastic bodies, which were practically modified Benedictine, until the rise of the Friars.

This Rule was drawn up by a man of supreme common sense. A system had to be devised by which men who bore no relation one to another had to live together in

Digitized by Google

harmony. Tempers, in those quarrelsome days, were apt to be unchecked, but plainly rebellion or quarrels would make a community hell instead of heaven. Accordingly, no one was allowed to join such a community without training in obedience, in silence, and in humility; and as idleness would infallibly have led to mischief, the time of the inmates was apportioned between worship, study and work. The intellectual were set to study, or to teach in school; the craftsman was encouraged to ply his craft, the results of his work, if unneeded by the community, being sold for its benefit, though such sale was to be 'rather under than over the market price'—the harmfulness of underselling not having occurred to minds guiltless of political economy. It was recommended that each house should have its own mill, well, garden, bakery, and handicraftsmen, so as to be independent of outsiders; and it soon happened that the growth of an abbey entailed much administrative work in the country round, though the actual labour in the fields came to be undertaken by serfs, attracted often by the gentler mastership of the monks.

There was no extreme asceticism in the Benedictine Rule. St. Benedict did not aim at producing Christian fakirs. Flesh meat was forbidden to all but the sick, but poultry, eggs, and fish might be consumed at option. Old men and children were dispensed from the rigour of the rule: the monks were to have beds with suitable coverings, and in the hot summer noons they were allowed a siesta after their midday meal. Voluntary self-denial was recommended for Lent, but not without the approval of the abbot. Sickly brethren were to be given light work. Hospitality was contemplated; the abbot was licensed to break his fast with guests, and might invite two or three to share the repast. Such meals were to be cooked by separate brethren in a separate kitchen, lest the ordinary cooks should be overworked.

The periods not taken up with prayer, meals, or sleep, were divided between manual labour and devout reading. Besides these occupations, the monks of St. Albans, whom we have chosen as a typical example, could obtain leave to

Digitized by Google

go out for walks, and recreation was evidently frequently taken. Study was earnestly prosecuted, and the monastery schools in England were the only ones existing until Alfred summoned St. Grimbald from Flanders to instruct the young nobles of his court. The Benedictines soon became a learned order, and in their monasteries the masterpieces of the classics were preserved to later ages.

It is plain that monasteries were regarded as havens of peace by the men and women whose duties lay in the fierce and tumultuous life outside; for such persons thought it worth while to pay large sums to important abbeys for a corrody, or board and lodging within the abbey precincts—or for the privilege of being buried in the holy ground of the abbey. Monastic life also greatly raised the position of women. A vocation other than marriage rendered the status of unmarried women equal or superior in dignity to that of their married sisters; the abbess of an important convent was often a much greater personage than the dame of the neighbouring castle. Rank, doubtless, often brought promotion with it as a matter of course, but merit and ability could lift their possessor to the highest posts in the Church, as in the case of Anselm and Grosseteste.

Another privilege of the abbeys made for good rather than evil while the hand of the law was capricious or uncertain in its action. This was the privilege of sanctuary. Where it was the custom to hang a criminal offhand, without waiting for any evidence for the defence, it made for justice that there should be a possibility of respite and appeal: it might do so at this day in the United States if negroes in danger of lynching were allowed to take sanctuary in the nearest church. The right of sanctuary, however, was not always respected, and then all the abbeys, not only in England, but on the Continent also, were up in arms. However jealous Bury and St. Albans, Glastonbury and Westminster might be of each other's privileges, they all stood shoulder to shoulder to protest against a common indignity.

The palmy days of the English monasteries lay between

Digitized by Google

the Conquest and the Peasant Revolt in 1378, known in contemporary literature as the Hurling-time. During that period they grew in power and wealth, and their very efficiency did much to bring about the time when they would become unnecessary; but it is possible that if as corporate bodies they had shewn consideration for anything except their own interests, use might have been found for them for a far longer period than was the case.

Such an abbey as Bury or St. Albans was a centre of civilization under the shadow of which it was impossible that a town, more or less important, should not grow to life. But where a town of freeborn Englishmen existed, it was equally impossible that sooner or later men should not struggle for the civic freedom which is the birthright of our race, and that the abbey, a great corporation with interests beyond the shores of England, should not strive as fiercely to retain what it considered its sacred rights.

Such a conflict is graphically described by monks of St. Albans in *Gesta Abbatum*, which gives the biography of the various abbots as they struck their contemporary or nearly contemporary chroniclers. One of these chroniclers was Walsingham, who has also given us the history of England from a monastic point of view, and who certainly had the power of telling a story, whether homely or marvellous.

We find the abbey of St. Albans in the fourteenth century a highly flourishing and important institution. It was extra-diocesan, and when a new abbot was elected, his election was confirmed, not by the bishop but by the Pope. How much the Pope interfered in the elections probably depended on his prosperous or unprosperous condition at the time. In 1326, when Richard of Wallingford was made abbot, his election was disputed. He spent upon his visit to Avignon, including the journey, a sum which Walsingham assesses at 923*l.* 10*s.* 11*d.*—at least ten thousand pounds in modern coinage; and in addition a sum of 720 marks representing the revenues of the abbey during the interval between Wallingford's informal and formal election, termed a vacancy of the benefice. Again,

Digitized by Google

if the abbey desired to convert one of the parishes the great tithes of which went to the abbey from a vicarage into a rectory, it had to pay the Pope in fees as much as twenty years' tithe. The freedom of a great abbey from diocesan supervision was dearly bought by becoming a milch-cow to the Pope, whether at Rome or Avignon; and we may well believe that the natural dislike of the English mind at seeing English money leave the country must have been intensified when its destination was a city under the influence of the very country with which England had fought for a hundred years.

Once elected, the abbot ruled a little kingdom with several dependencies, each of which was a considerable estate in itself. There were several daughter houses, each under a prior, which went by the name of cells, though they were by no means necessarily small. There was a cell at Hatfield Peverel, a cell at Redburn, a cell as far off as Tynemouth, and probably several more. The *Gesta Abbatum* gives a catalogue of the property acquired by the abbey in the reign of each abbot: between 1260 and 1290 in Abbot Roger's time, the abbey acquired nearly 100 new possessions, among which are such items as these;

Market at Codecote on Friday.
Fair at Codecote.
Five messuages in Fishpool Street.
Shop in St. Albans.
Two pieces of land.
Common in Barnet Wood.
Harpsfield to find one horse for the Abbot's journeys to Tynemouth;

—and so on for page after page. Besides these, there were various 'rights' which brought in money to the abbey, and which it never let slip. It had a 'right' to contributions from rectories and vicarages, and a 'right' to the chattels of executed felons. Such rights were sometimes disputed, but the abbey won its cause. The Benedictine system of self-containedness had caused the abbey to keep its own lawyers, as it kept its own bakers or cooks, and its causes were tried in its own courts. 'I'll be judge, I'll be jury,

Digitized by Google

said cunning old Fury, I'll try the whole cause, and condemn you to death.' The mouse's fate was generally that of the abbey's opponents also.

The most oppressive of the abbey rights were those which claimed for the abbey corporation a monopoly of some necessity or convenience required by the people outside its walls over whom it claimed jurisdiction. Where wheat or barley was the staple article of food it was a necessity that grain should be ground; and the abbeys, like other landholders, when they had erected a mill, naturally charged a fee to outsiders who made use of it. But as the neighbouring population increased in numbers and in mechanical skill, they preferred to erect their own mill and charge their own prices. This interfered with the abbey perquisite of fees for 'multure,' and the law was called in to forbid the erection of any second mill within the abbey jurisdiction, or to pull it down if it had been erected. Then handmills were devised which could be worked at home, and the abbey demanded the surrender of the handmills. Throughout the fourteenth century the mill question was a fruitful source of litigation and ill-feeling.

The same system of monopoly held in the case of education. The abbey of St. Albans kept a good school, which the citizens of the neighbouring town attended, and whence the more promising scholars were sent with exhibitions to Oxford. It was probably more efficient than a private-venture school was likely to be; but the abbey was not content to offer better wares than its competitors. It excommunicated a private schoolmaster who opened a second school in the town without the authorization of the abbot.

The town which we now call St. Albans, had grown up under the shadow of the abbey, but it became much averse to be called by the name of the abbey's patron saint. The old Roman name of Verulam had lived on, or been revived, under the form of Warlhamchester, and a legend had arisen that it had been refounded by a special charter of King Offa. Whether King Offa had been in a sufficiently advanced state of education to bestow charters was not a question which perplexed the honest citizens;

Digitized by Google

but plainly the abbey chroniclers resented their desire to have a name and history of their own, apart from the abbey. The jurisdiction which the abbey claimed over the town was an ever-increasing source of bitterness. The abbey was a corporation, with as little conscience as any lay corporation, bent on enlarging its own interests, and managed by far abler men than the town could boast, wholly inaccessible to bribes or compromises. Behind the abbey lawyers lay the machinery of the law of the land, easily manipulated in the abbey's courts; behind the law lay the authority of the king, easily reached by the abbot or the abbot's friends in high place; behind the king lay the power of appeal to the Pope. A plaintiff seldom had money enough to go on litigating for ever while all these authorities were summoned to crush him one by one. The abbey had giant power and it used it like a giant, without mercy to man or beast. One of the abbey tenants, John Chiltern, not paying his rent, his herd of fifty cows was seized for distraint. The abbot threatened that if he did not pay up his cows would not be fed. 'I am not going to be dictated to by my beasts,' was the reply; and starved the poor beasts were. The chronicler seems to feel that the act needs some apology, and lays it to the advice of the lawyers.

But perhaps the oppression that weighed heaviest upon the townsfolk was the fact that whereas outside the abbey jurisdiction temporal crimes were visited by temporal punishment, within it the penalty of excommunication was adjudged for any opposition to the abbot's will. The fallacy which some preachers still proclaim, that 'a sin against an infinite being is an infinite sin and demands infinite punishment,' was carried out in the code of abbey law. To snare a rabbit in a layman's wood was an ordinary offence; to snare the same rabbit on abbey ground was a sin against St. Alban, and became sacrilege. It was hardly surprising if the townsmen felt that the abbey played its game with loaded dice.

The administration of the abbey varied with the character of the abbot in power. Abbot Hugh, in 1308–26, was a free-handed and somewhat extravagant personage. Once

Digitized by Google

he went to visit a neighbour called Hethersett who had an infant son in the cradle. The child cried—according to the hardhearted chronicler, it was made to cry on purpose—and Abbot Hugh granted it a pension of 40 shillings yearly for its life, which lasted fifty years. Various indications suggest that the morals as well as the expenditure of the Abbey were free during Hugh's reign; but Abbot Richard of Wallingford, who succeeded him, was a reformer. It was he who spent a fortune on going to Avignon; and during the nine years of his abbacy he was afflicted with leprosy, and had to wear a white linen mask. In spite of his infirmity, he ruled both monastery and town with a high hand. The prior and brethren of Redburn were forbidden to hunt, or to leap over and pull down their neighbours' hedges, and the discipline of the monastery in general was tightened. But the town felt his iron hand as much as the monastery. During Abbot Hugh's lax rule the town had made a seal of office and had collected for its own expenses, thus denying the jurisdiction of the abbey. One of the townsmen was a 'bold bad man' named Marshall, who probably deserved his fate; the abbot sent his squire to apprehend him for adultery. A scuffle ensued in the town, in which both Marshall and the abbot's squire were killed. When the trial was held, the townsmen refused to allow the jury to be packed with 'aliens'—whether aliens from the town or country we do not know. But Abbot Richard fought them and won his cause. Then he turned his attention to the mill question, and went to law with the town with regard to it. Under Abbot Hugh's rule three mills had been built for the town, and eighty handmills were owned by various citizens: thirteen of these were considered to have legal justification. In the reign of Henry III., certain charters had been granted to the town which gave the townspeople definite rights as against the abbey, and had Edward I. been on the throne instead of Edward II., they might have kept them. But Abbot Richard had influence and powerful friends, and he determined to crush the town once for all by making it surrender its charters. His manner of carrying out his design was

Digitized by Google

rather crafty than Christian. He invited the townspeople to a feast, and prevented one of the most influential of them, Richard of Pyriton, from departing with the rest. Then, whether by threats or promises—the chronicler seems rather hazy, and possibly ashamed, regarding the methods pursued—Pyriton was induced to enter into a bond to persuade his fellow-townsmen to yield to the abbot's desires. Whether *force majeure* was used to induce Pyriton and the townsmen to yield what in the next generation many of them died to regain, or whether spiritual threats extorted consent, we shall never now know; but the abbot triumphed all along the line. He placed the town under a bond of 3,000 marks forfeit to recognize the abbey's jurisdiction, he pulled down the three water-mills and cemented their six mill-stones into the Abbot's parlour, and he forced the townsmen to surrender their much prized handmills.

For forty years the town remained prostrate beneath the hand of the abbey, and in 1349 began the long and eventful abbacy of Thomas de la Mare, whose gravestone may still be seen to the south of the high altar. Abbot Thomas was a man of fine presence and high birth. He had suave manners and a cold heart, and he inherited the traditions of Richard of Wallingford. He was of spotless morals, and he had himself scourged every Friday by his own monks; but he seems to have been crafty rather than courageous in dealing with his opponents—indeed the abbots of St. Albans, as a rule, do not shine brilliantly in personal courage. He was utterly unscrupulous in supporting the rights of the abbey, whether in religious or secular matters. The Franciscan and Dominican Orders formulated a combined request to be allowed to hear confessions and to preach within the jurisdiction of the abbey. This was refused with contempt, much as a non-resident bishop of George II.'s time would have refused a similar request from a Methodist preacher. The chroniclers tell how, a certain allowance of bread being withdrawn from the Dominicans, they had the impertinence to appeal to Rome, successfully, for its continuance. 'From this

Digitized by Google

others may learn in time to shake off the viper from their bosom, and to remove the mouse from the handmill, the thorn from the eye, and from the side the deadly dart!' When the chronicler stops his narrative of the 'Hurling-Time' to suggest the cause of the troubles, he fixes on the deterioration of the Mendicant Orders as the cause of the wrath of Heaven, as worse than the laxness of bishops, the irreligion of nobles, or the drunkenness and immorality of the people, and quotes the proverb 'A friar, a liar.' It is instructive to see that the possibility of fault in his own Order does not strike him at all. Of John Wiclif he speaks as the beast which has issued from the mouth of hell, but in connexion with a story of the desecration of the Host by a fourteenth century Kensitite. However, it seems plain that the atmosphere of thought in the abbey must have been of the high-and-dry kind, and it is curious to think of an ecclesiastical circle in which Thomas Aquinas must have been regarded as a daring Dominican innovator.

Meanwhile the town of St. Albans, though crushed, still cherished the hope of some day recovering its liberty. It was not its 'hooligan' element, but its grave and sober citizens, who waited for an opportunity of asserting their rights. William Grindecobbe's two brothers were brethren in the abbey, and Richard of Wallingford was namesake and kinsman of the redoutable leper abbot. Grindecobbe, and probably his colleagues also, had been educated at the abbey school, where Grindecobbe had been an exhibitioner. Hostilities began by small annoyances such as would now be dealt with at quarter sessions or in county courts, but then were thought worthy to be punished by excommunication. A wall surrounded the abbey precincts, and against this wall some of the citizens had built houses; and one had gone so far as to break a window in the wall, which enabled him to look into the sacrist's garden. The abbot determined to build a clay wall outside the abbey wall to stop this nuisance and to have all houses pulled down within a certain distance of the wall. This, however, was an infringement of the freedom of the townsmen outside the abbey: Grindecobbe and some others forbade the brethren who

Digitized by Google

came to survey for the new wall to proceed with their measurements, and they were driven away with the measuring rod of one of them broken across his back. Grindecobbe was publicly excommunicated, and had to do penance in his shirt before the Chapter, his relation to the brethren and his position in the town excusing him from making his amends before the whole congregation. The chronicler conceives this to have been the reason 'that in the insurrection of the commons he raged with the greater fury, and more importunately spoke to demand liberties, not only for himself, but for his neighbours, poor and unknown.' That a man should demand liberties for himself the chronicler thinks but natural; but for the poor? The standard of monastic philanthropy does not seem to have been high.

But at last the abbey found its autocratic government no longer unquestioned. In June 1378 the Peasant Revolt broke out. All over England the downtrodden serfs were rising to demand of the king their rights and liberties against their masters; and the abbey towns, such as Bury and St. Albans, saw their chance of shaking off the heavy hand of their oppressors. One day the men of Barnet came to St. Albans with the news that Tiler was at Highbury with 20,000 men, threatening to march north to deliver all villans from their lords, and to give to fire and sword all who opposed him. Barnet suffered from abbey oppression as well as St. Albans, and desired to know if the townsmen would join them in making an effort to end the tyranny of the abbey. The townsmen were solid citizens, and deliberated over two courses, each in its way dangerous. They might wait till Tiler and his Kentishmen arrived and die at their hands, while their homes were sacked by such anarchists as Jack Straw; or they might go to Tiler as friends, and persuade him to turn his attention in another direction, disregarding the probability that any attempt to communicate with the rebels would brand them as disloyal in the eyes of the abbey. Grindecobbe, Cadyndon, Barker and Wallingford, determined to consult the abbot. They found the abbot and brethren half wild with fear, and

Digitized by Google

ready to catch with thankfulness at the notion of the townsmen's intercession for the abbey with Tiler. He proposed to send four of the brethren with the townsmen as delegates from the abbey, but these brethren, hearing that Tiler had sworn a special hatred to 'religious,' esteemed discretion the better part of valour, left the townsmen to deal with Tiler, and rode on to London to appeal to the king. Tiler told the townsmen that if they could manage their matters without him, well; if not, they might tell the abbot that he would send twenty thousand men to shave his beard, and hang him and his monks from the minster tower.

Grindecobbe and his companions, on leaving Tiler, thought that their opportunity had come to redress the wrongs of their town by getting the king to command the abbey to restore their lost charters. Richard was riding out to Mile-end to meet the Essex men there encamped, and six times on his way Grindecobbe prostrated himself in the royal path and implored justice against the abbey. Excited, interested, and amused, the boy king made no difficulty in promising an order to the abbot to deliver up the charters, and Wallingford remained behind to bring back the order when drawn out. The other men returned home at once with the good news of their success, and crowds of excited villans who fondly believed that their own liberty was won, crowded into the town. As they exulted, the brethren despaired. Prior John de Moote, eventually abbot, was a most unpopular personage, for having two houses in the town, one on each side of the Fish Market, he had joined them by building another across, shutting out all air and light from the market. He, with the subchancellor and three more of the brethren, took horse by night for Tynemouth, and were seen no more at St. Albans till the troubles ended.

The arrival of Richard of Wallingford with the promised demand to the abbot from the king took place next day. He made a triumphal entrance into the town, one of his men bearing before him the banner of the insurgents—the pennon of St. George of England. His appearance was

Digitized by Google

taken by the mob as allowing licence for an attack on the abbey, but this was by no means the desire of the townsmen, and Wallingford, taking the flagstaff in his arms, planted it in front of the abbey gate. He bade the crowd to guard it, and by no means to advance beyond it, while the townsmen went into the abbey to communicate the king's letter to the abbot.

The abbot, on hearing the townsmen's request for an audience, at first declared that he would rather die than part with any of the privileges of the blessed Alban to his enemies; but there was a menacing crowd outside the abbey, and the abbot came into the nave followed by a procession of brethren. Wallingford with all due reverence handed him the letter in a silken bag. It began 'Very dear in God,' and went on to 'will and command' the restoration to the burgesses of the charters of Henry III. which they had had to surrender, concerning rights of common, of pasture, of fishing, and of certain other commodities expressed in the same charters; and it ended 'Richard Rex.' The abbot read it and pleaded that it was against his conscience to part with St. Alban's patrimony; but Grindecobbe reminded him that what the law gave the law could take away. 'The king's grant has done much damage to the towns when the monasteries have had his ear; now we of the towns have gained his ear, and we trust to win back our losses.' The abbot pleaded for time to consult his Chapter, but he was reminded that the mob was at the abbey doors, and what had to be done must be done at once.

Abbot Thomas wrung his hands. 'Alack, alack, good neighbours, for this thirty-two years I have been your easy abbot and father, and never harmed you or done you ill; when you have been in straits with pestilence or famine, my hand has been always open to supply your needs; and now you seek, for no cause, to undo me, your easy friend and master.' They replied politely that the town had no personal grudge against the abbot, and would have preferred to leave the question of the charters untouched until his death; but at this moment they had no choice, being

Digitized by Google

in danger themselves of being torn in pieces by the mob if they tarried too long. The blows upon the great door gave point to their words, and the abbot implored them to go forth to pacify the people, leaving Wallingford behind to fetch the charters out. He promised them the charters which Henry III. had given and Abbot Richard had taken away, the bond for 3,000 marks to ensure their good behaviour, and the bonds of servitude and other parchments signed under compulsion from the abbey.

The rest of the deputation went out to pacify the mob, and Grindecobbe perceived that unless some other entertainment were provided he would not be able to keep them off the abbey. He suggested that a bonfire should be prepared at the Market Cross, where the bonds of servitude should be consumed. The crowd was lured away from the abbey, and Grindecobbe exhorted his followers to keep order, and to put to shame those who spake of the commons as law-breakers. Two houses, however, belonging to the abbey bailiffs were sacked, and their contents destroyed like the property of John of Gaunt at the Savoy, a few days before.

Wallingford came out with the promised charters and bonds, and the work of destruction of the latter went on merrily, until a whisper went round that the most valuable of all the charters had not been returned. Old men had seen the charter *De Libertatibus Villanorum*, and remembered how it began with two emblazoned letters, one in gold and one in azure. The bonfire lost its interest, and the mob rushed back to the abbey to demand the missing charter. The townsmen went in again to the abbot to ask for it, and while they were within the crowd broke open the abbey prison. They let all the prisoners out except one, a murderer, whom they hanged on the spot to prove that they were on the side of the law. Then the abbot himself came out of the west door with a great book under his arm, in which was a copy of the lost charter. He said that he had asked the major brethren, and they were questioning the minor brethren, but the original of the charter he solemnly swore he had never seen. This was

Digitized by Google

undoubtedly true, for he was too much terrified to refuse it if he had had it.

Now arose a cry for the six precious millstones which had been cemented down in the pavement of the Abbot's Parlour. The abbot said that the millstones could not be taken up without tools; but tools were immediately forthcoming, and Grindecobbe led a party into the Abbot's Parlour, and brought out the millstones with him. Then for some time longer he kept the mob quiet by breaking up the millstones, forming the people into line, and bidding them each to come up in orderly fashion to receive his chip of stone for remembrance, 'like men who receive holy bread in church.' Hardly was this finished when a party of Barnet men were found to have laid faggots before the inner door of the abbey—the outer door had been broken open when the prisoners were released—and would have fired the door, had not one of the townsmen climbed on to the faggots and shouted that it was for St. Alban's men to do what they would to their own abbey, and strangers were to have no part in it.

The abbot here produced a diversion by sending out a large provision of bread and ale to appease the hungry crowd. He had to confess that he could not find *De Libertatibus Villanorum*, but promised that if the crowd would disperse, he would make out a new charter to the same effect. Grindecobbe pointed out that a new charter would not be in any way the same thing. 'For we do not desire to extort from you new and unjust claims: we come to ask for our own, to which we have a right in law and justice.'

The abbot promised to continue the search, and the night came down upon the disputants. During the day a party of the townsmen had gone round to the various woods and commons which the abbey had enclosed and destroyed the gates as an assertion of the town's right: and in spite of the missing charter, the citizens were triumphant. But that night news came which altered the situation. Tiler was dead, and with his death the abbot's panic was at an end; the next day two knights with a party

Digitized by Google

of men at arms came to the abbey with a second letter from the king, urging the townsmen to do no damage to the abbot. The townsmen professed themselves glad that the letter had arrived to strengthen the cause of order, and proceeded to call a meeting at the Moot Hall, where they proclaimed that all creditors of the abbey were to take their bonds thither at once and demand quittance—payment to creditors seems usually to have been made or delayed at the good pleasure of the abbey bursar. A procession of townsmen was also appointed to walk the confines of the town proclaiming the rights of way, the rights of common, and the rights of fishery won from the abbey.

Nevertheless, the tide had turned. For a few days the abbot went on granting charters freely to Barnet and the other towns which demanded them; but at the same time he was gradually increasing the force of men-at-arms within the abbey. He had the missing charter drawn out afresh and sealed with St. Alban's seal; but the chronicler observes that the seal stuck to the wax, a sure sign that the Saint disapproved. Then came the news that the king was going to send Sir Walter Atte Lee as commissioner, with two knights as assessors, to inquire into the disturbance, and great was the joy of the abbey and the searching of heart in the town.

Many of the burgesses at once began to move themselves and their goods out of the place, and Grindecobbe, as the leader who had demanded the charters, was strongly urged to take flight from St. Albans. Grindecobbe replied that he was not ashamed of his actions; he had acted according to law under the king's seal, there were thirty towns and villages in league with the townsmen, and if the commissioner's intentions were not honest, they were still strong enough to whip him out of the town. He headed a party of the burgesses who rode out to meet the commissioner and escort him with all honour into St. Albans. Two days later he was arrested as he was riding home unarmed from a public meeting called by the commissioner in Derfold Wood, thrown into the abbey prison, and carried off next day to Hertford jail, beyond reach of rescue

Digitized by Google

from the townsmen. With him were imprisoned Wallingford and the other leading citizens who had opposed the abbey, which now, taking courage, once more demanded the surrender of the charters.

The trial was held at Hertford before a judge known to be in the abbey interest; the abbey squires, the witnesses for the prosecution, were accusing the prisoners with vehement invective, and their condemnation was imminent, when a messenger came post haste to the abbey to recall the squires. The commissioner had sent his troops off elsewhere, the abbey was almost denuded of armed defenders, and the mob was once more thundering at its gates for the release of Grindecobbe. Next day Grindecobbe was sent for and offered his life if he would return to St. Albans and persuade his fellow-townsmen to surrender the charters, under penalty of a heavy bail to the town if he disappeared. His fellow-prisoners persuaded him to accept the offer, and once again he stood in the Moot Hall; but this time his popularity appeared greatly lessened by the dread of his friends that he would take the chance to disappear and leave them to pay his bail. They were safe enough. Grindecobbe, 'cujus cor,' says the chronicler, 'jam induratum in malo fuerat,' urged them to disregard his own life. 'Do that, and nothing else, which you would have done had I been slain yesterday at Hertford. My life matters little, but your freedom is worth the death of many; so hold fast what you have won.'

The crowd was filled with impotent fury. They came together in the market-place and clamoured for Grindecobbe to lead them against the abbey, to take Sir Walter and 'humanely' cut off his head, to do anything to save himself. Grindecobbe made his last appeal to them to keep quiet. No good, he said, would result from further violence—only fresh misery for the town. They had best go home and give no further cause of offence. Percy and Warwick were on their march to occupy the place. 'What we did before we did according to law, but if we did this much evil would ensue, both to us and to the innocent in

Digitized by Google

this town.' He surrendered himself on the appointed day, and was taken back to prison.

The abbot's troubles were not at an end. Warwick and Percy delayed their coming to quiet their own estates, and the townsmen chaffed the supposed disappointment of the abbot in a doggerel song which infuriated him :

> 'Salt thy flesh, good Abbot, bake full hard thy flour,
> Sell thy goodly butter, lest it turneth sour!'

The women would not give a civil word to the soldiers, and the crown of the offences was the story that was told of the abbot's consenting to treat with Tiler. This was, unfortunately, true, though he would have been glad to forget it. The abbot sent word to the king that he was 'delated' in the town, and Richard with his army marched to St. Albans to punish the enemies of the abbey.

When the townsmen heard that the king was really coming, the prospect of their homes sacked and ruined broke down all their courage. They agreed to restore the charters, to replace the millstones, to pay the fine imposed by the abbot, and to rebuild the wrecked houses belonging to the abbey. But they were not yet so tame in the abbot's hand as to agree to deliver up their champions to death at his will. The first jury summoned at the trial refused to indict or convict the malefactors, saying that they knew no malefactors to be indicted. A second jury indicted, but refused to convict; a third jury was tricked into convicting. Grindecobbe, with a score of his comrades, was hanged on a great gallows outside the town, and the bodies were left swinging there through the dog-days to poison the air. An attempt was made to take the bodies down and give them Christian burial, but it was baffled by the vigilance of the abbey watchers, and the chronicler makes brutally merry over the gruesome condition of the month-old corpses, and the fact that the burgesses were forced to re-hang them, some of them in chains taken off their own dogs, the original chains being lost. 'Because it was right that these detractors, perjured and hateful to God, should be shewn to be worse than dogs, in that their dogs

Digitized by Google

being set free, they themselves should be chained and compelled to so disgusting a servitude.'

Abbot Thomas was not satisfied with hanging his principal opponents; he also determined to stop the tongues of the survivors. He sent his bailiffs to proclaim that whereas the townsmen and townswomen were known to speak slanderously of the abbot, to say that he had acted unlawfully to their hurt and damage, and to trouble with their tongues him and his servants; henceforth every man convicted of false speaking against the abbot should be hanged, and every woman burnt alive. The chronicler does not mention whether any executions on this ground actually followed; but as one of the victims hanged had been a boy who had caught a rabbit on the day when the town rights were proclaimed over the abbey enclosures, and who in consequence had been apprehended for sacrilege, we cannot suppose that Abbot Thomas was too merciful to allow them to take place.

Such is the picture of abbey administration as given by its own chronicler, who plainly considers the opponents of the abbot the opponents of Heaven. His merit is that his relation is an honest one; he neither excuses the abbot, nor vilifies the citizens except with epithets. To him, right and wrong mean the advancement or the damage of the interests of the abbey and its patron saint; and anything further removed from the ethics of Christianity it is impossible to conceive.

Grindecobbe, a civic martyr, died an ignominious death and was denied Christian burial; Abbot Thomas, in extreme old age, passed away in the odour of sanctity. Nevertheless the patriotic citizen won in the long run. From the time of the Peasant Revolt onward, the abbeys withered and perished, and a century and a half later the end came. The prior who had run away before the riots succeeded Abbot Thomas, and squandered the revenues of the abbey in building, leaving it in debt. In 1410 a warning note was sounded when Parliament proposed to confiscate all the temporalities held by bishops, abbots, and priors, and petitioned the Crown to employ their revenues in paying a

Digitized by Google

standing army of knights and soldiers, endowing a hundred hospitals, and making small yearly payments to the secular clergy. It was not a new notion in England that religious property could be confiscated; 'alien priories' had been dissolved in 1337 by Edward III., and were dissolved again in 1416. Though the petition was not granted, the fact of its being made was a sign of the change of the times. For a century longer the abbeys lingered on, shorn of their old power as of their old usefulness. Like the wicked uncle in the 'Babes in the Wood,' 'their lands were mortgaged all,' and the less wealthy gradually ceased to exist for want of funds. Their schools and their doles still fulfilled a function in social life, but they no longer possessed the able administrators of the previous century, and in the records of Archbishop Warham's Visitations it is plain that they were heavily encumbered, and were a hindrance rather than a help to the natural development of the country. In 1523 Wolsey obtained bulls from the Pope authorizing the suppression of forty small monasteries on the score of uselessness, and the application of their funds to educational purposes. By this time only half the number of religious houses founded in England were in existence; the others had died out.

They still had a potential power for trouble. They might be superannuated and tottering, but Giant Pope, more vigorous than in Bunyan's allegory, might be called upon at any time to back them up in a quarrel with Crown or people. No patriotic Englishman would have raised a finger to keep them in their condition of antiquated privilege, and it was expected that if they were dissolved their funds would be devoted to national education. The greed of Henry VIII. and his courtiers deprived England of what might have been the finest school system in Europe.

Whether the Reformation had come or not, it is plain that the abbeys were practically dead and must have been dissolved; but neither Protestantism nor moral indignation were concerned in the matter. They perished simply because they had become a social incubus.

M. Bramston.

Digitized by Google

ART. VII.—BOOKS ABOUT CHILDREN.

1. *The History of the Fairchild Family, or the Child's Manual.* Being a Collection of Stories calculated to show the Importance and Effects of a Religious Education. By MARY MARTHA SHERWOOD. Part I., 1818; Part II., 1842; Part III., 1847. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.)
2. *The Works of Juliana Horatia Ewing* [1841–1885]. Sixteen volumes. (S.P.C.K.)
3. *A Child's Garden of Verses.* By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1893.)
4. *The Golden Age* (1896) and *Dream Days* (1899). By KENNETH GRAHAME. (London: John Lane.)
5. *The Little White Bird.* By J. M. BARRIE. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1902.)
6. *The Noisy Years.* By MABEL DEARMER. (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1902.)
7. *A Romance of the Nursery.* By E. ALLEN HARKER. (London: John Lane, 1903.)
8. *Concerning Paul and Fiammetta.* By the same. (London: Edward Arnold, 1906.)
9. *New Treasure Seekers.* By E. NESBIT. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1904.)
10. *Oswald Bastable and Others.* By the same. (London: Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., 1905.)

SOME twenty years ago Mr. Watts-Dunton wrote an essay on *The New Hero*—his new hero was the child. But the cult of childhood is not so new after all; it is at least coeval with Christianity. All through the Middle Ages artists were inspired by the thought of the Mother and the Child, while the sweet Lives of the little saints read as though they were written in the childhood of the world. The Chancellor Gerson, reformer and controversialist, gathered the children about him and besought their prayers. Fra Angelico found in them the types for angelic beings; and Savonarola, notwithstanding his austerity, was humble in the presence of innocents. At the Renaissance, Sir Thomas

Digitized by Google

More could forget his ermine and his dignity, and write pretty letters full of playfulness to 'his sweet babes.' Even Montaigne admits his delight 'in the running up and down of children'; and Bishop Andrewes in his prayers did not forget to thank God 'for the sweetening of the world by infants.'

Shakespeare introduced more than one pert little boy into his plays. He knew the value of children in art—their *naïveté* and pathos. Fuller dedicated his *Pisgah's Sight of Palestine* to a little lord; and, later still, 'Namby Pamby' Phillips wrote odes to the small offspring of great people. These appreciations were intended to flatter parents, and Gay was perhaps the first writer of distinction in England who deliberately wrote for the very young. Later still, Shenstone found his happiest inspiration in a village school; and Wordsworth glorified child-life in his 'Intimations of Immortality.'

And yet, for all this, Mr. Watts-Dunton was right. The child as a hero for poets and novelists is new. He now sits enthroned in the place once filled by his elder sister. Not her wilful whim, but his unconscious humour lightens the pages of fiction. We are asked to weep above a little cot rather than over a hopeless love entanglement. Our delight in heroism is satisfied by a small boy with a tin sword; we no longer demand a Guardsman with a Victoria Cross.

But how are we to account for this prevalent taste for the nursery and its details? At first sight it might be supposed to spring from the great number of women writers and a probable preponderance of women readers. But we remember at once that child life has been delineated and interpreted as successfully by men. Swinburne, Pater, Stevenson, Kenneth Grahame, William Canton, Barrie, and Kipling have all contributed of their best to this new literature. It is not lacking in virility; it is amazing in its variety.

The Cynic, indeed, may remark that we live in a sentimental age, and are suffering not only from a softening of the heart but also from a softening of the brain; that the

Digitized by Google

old world approaches its dotage, and would conceal its waning powers by an affectation of childishness. But every other age was equally sentimental; and our sentimentality is surely more healthy than that of our grandparents. It is better to cry over *Misunderstood* than over the tales supplied to Lydia Languish. Our emotions find a more natural vent than in the days of Byronism; and it is something to our credit that we can read Mrs. Sherwood and cannot read the Countess of Blessington.

The Pessimist might provide a better explanation. He might urge that we are tired and disillusioned; that we would escape from the actualities of life into a world where everything is played at. Life has become so complex and so disappointing that we long for simplicity and Nursery Tea. We like to remember the time when we could echo that couplet of Stevenson's:

> 'The world is so full of a number of things,
> I am sure we should all be as happy as Kings.'

We find a pleasure in self-mockery when we attend seriously to the mimicry of children. We are quizzing ourselves when we put into the mouths of little people the principles by which we live. Reduced to the simple terms of an infantile vocabulary, much that is thought of as recondite wisdom is shewn to be folly in disguise.

Whatever truth may lurk in the Pessimist's explanation as to the popularity of nursery books, it certainly does not account for their being written. Most of the authors are genuine child-lovers; they write of what interests themselves. Some of them write so well because they have remained so young, and for those young in heart the word 'pessimism' has no meaning.

The Optimist also has his explanation. He sees in this literature the guarantee that the ties of family life are not loosened, that we still reverence Motherhood and the sanctities of home. He thinks also that we are beginning to understand what Our Blessed Lord meant when He told us to become as little children. He hopes that our faces are set towards the Kingdom of Heaven. He speaks of the

Digitized by Google

instinctive devotion of men to an ideal of purity and virginity.

There is much to be said for the Optimist's point of view, but it is not to be justified by all the facts. Mrs. Ewing and Mrs. Allen Harker do indeed glorify the home, but many of our little heroes in fiction are without any reverence for the home or anything else. They are delightful fawn-like figures, inconsequent and irresponsible, living their own lives for themselves alone, and they only regard their elders in so far as they minister to their pleasures or mar them. Now Puck provides plentiful entertainment in a book. He touches us lightly to laughter or tears. We are delighted to hear of his tricks. We should like to play with him, kiss and tickle him; but we refuse to regard him as a moral being or to consider his moral significance.

Some recent books go further and make our hearts ache. Mr. W. H. Hudson, for instance, recently produced one which is called *A Little Boy Lost*. It is beautiful as Nature is beautiful, and Mr. Hudson is a Naturalist. Like Nature, too, it suggests much that is tender while it remains heartless. The little boy, predestined to wander, loses his mother without a regret, escapes from the kindly savage women who would have fostered him, and from the beautiful Lady of the Hills who loved him as her own child. He longs to know, to see, to touch, to feel; he is sensitive to all that is beautiful; he delights in all that is living; with a shout of joy he welcomes the sea. He can weep over a dead flamingo, and laugh with Old Jacob; he accepts caresses in the comfortable lap of the Lady of the Hills; but he has no heart for his kind, no gratitude, no memory, no morals. He never feels the need of support. It is a fairy tale wonderfully told; and yet we closed the book with a sigh—how hopeless and unsatisfying are all things without God in the world!

Must we, then, conclude that the motive which inspires the Nursery Literature is restricted to an artistic appreciation of childhood? By no means; and yet it is often nothing more. Children are so pretty; they are such

Digitized by Google

responsive pets; their blunders are so amusing in story-books; and their naughtiness reminds us of a past that we like to remember, do not repent of, and at least in the story-books do not condemn. Their ambitions are so grotesque, often so grandiose; their imagination is unfettered by the possibilities of prosaic life. Their woes are so real, so like our own, that we can sympathize, and yet so transitory that we can smile. They are so weak, and small, and helpless that their little hands appeal to our compassion; they are so impertinent, noisy, and assertive that we must needs attend to them. They offer themselves with irresistible *abandon* as a subject for the facile pen. In consequence, they have been exploited by the sentimentalists whose books are labelled *sweet*, by the humourists whose books are labelled *charming*, and by the poor creatures who try to be *funny*. The last have the lightest task, for nothing is easier to produce than Master Malaprop. And none of these writers should miss their public. We all wish to be sweetened, charmed, and made to laugh.

This brings us to our second point—why, if the prevalent taste for the Nursery be so natural, was it not satisfied before? Our answer to this question would be that in olden time children were not allowed sufficient freedom in the presence of their elders in order to display their own proper loveliness. In the earlier Middle Ages, no doubt, they had much freedom, but then there was but little literature. As time crept on, the belief that 'all virtues are closed in courtesy and all vices in villany' became crystallized in a code of manners, quite artificial and very precise. When such manners made men or marred them, children were at a disadvantage. All spontaneity was discouraged, and they had not lived long enough to find in art second nature. Good Master Russell and others very properly wished to impress their charges

> 'With a sense of the weight of the word "behave"';

but children are not most attractive when repeating lessons.

With the Tudors came despotism, and the spirit of tyranny permeated every department of life. Anyone who

Digitized by Google

reads Ascham's account of what Lady Jane Grey had to suffer from her odious parents will understand why children did not 'shew off' in those days. No doubt there were exceptions even then, and some children were indulged; but a king's favourite, a favourite slave and a favourite child, and all others allowed privileges through partiality denied to their degree, incur the odium of mankind. 'A favourite has no friends,' says Gray; and 'My Lady's eldest son, evermore tattling,' was no exception to this rule.

Then came Puritanism with other reasons for suppressing children. Puritans were more preoccupied with original sin than with actual transgressions; and as they did not much believe in sacramental grace they whipped the offending Adam out of children. High spirits were a sign of the devil's possession—what was joyous was dangerous to morals, and demonstrativeness had something of the nature of sin. John Wesley's mother was an admirable matron who brought up a large family on small means. She treated boys and girls alike; and 'when turned a year old (and some before) they were taught to fear the rod and *to cry softly*.'

Children then, no doubt, were quite as happy as they are now, but they did not lend themselves to literary treatment. Children then, as now, laughed and played, quarrelled and fought, got into mischief, cultivated their gift for wonder, and aspired to heroism. But they did all these things, so far as possible, by themselves out of the way. In the presence of their elders they were stiff and prim; they knew it was for them to stand and wait; they spoke when they were spoken to, said 'Sir' and 'Madam,' did as they were told directly, or were promptly disciplined with the birch.

We have grown more tender-hearted in these latter days. We may have grown wiser; we have certainly grown more careless as to how our little ones behave. Our grandfathers, if they were too pompous to treat their children as playmates, at least never regarded them as playthings. They strove to mould and fashion miniature men and women, and were at most tolerant of a childishness soon

Digitized by Google

to be outgrown. Chesterfield, writing from Babiole to his grandson, and the author of *The Edifying History of Miss Jemima Meek*, had this in common; they were solicitous about the future. Neither regretted nursery days, neither thought of infancy with delight. Both were compassionate in their endeavours to shew the way how to escape from childishness.

But if children did not provide materials for literature, they had their own books. Chapmen carried in their packs the sanguinary stories of *Jack the Giant Killer* and *Jack and the Bean Stalk*. There were many other 'wild tales' approved of by Charles Lamb. Richard Johnson was successful with his *Seven Champions*, and the charming book prepared at Little Gidding was not successful. It has only been unearthed and reprinted in these latter days. Perault's tales made their way into England, and children appropriated to themselves *Pilgrim's Progress*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and *Gulliver's Travels*, which had not been intended for them.

As the eighteenth century advanced Mr. Newbery began to tempt 'little masters and misses' to improve their naughty ways by little books adorned with gilt and Dutch paper. He also cared for the health of their bodies, and sold 'Dr. James's Powders' and other patent medicines. He had a tradesman's eye to his own profits, and the stories puffed his remedies not without humour. 'He was the honestest man in creation,' said Dr. Goldsmith; and he throve upon morality and purges. His tales shew the kindliness that resorts to masking powder in jam; and his readers must have been greedy of jam to stand such an intolerable deal of powder. It was a moral age, or rather an age of moralizing. Omniscient parents with a gift for exposition answer at length children with a passion for information; pattern parents inflict salutary punishments with awful warnings that the said punishments may be repeated and prolonged in another world. And yet these little books were popular—the wicked children especially so. The small reader is a censorious person with an appetite for exemplary justice where he is not personally concerned.

Digitized by Google

He is like Tom Tulliver, who 'was particularly clear on one point—namely, that he would punish everybody who deserved it: why, he wouldn't have minded being punished himself, if he deserved it; but then, he never *did* deserve it.'

The nineteenth century began with a belief in enlightenment. The day had come for 'the learned friend.' Children suffered from him, as well as their elders, and Coleridge quizzes

'the numberless writers of the small but luminous works on arts, trades and sciences, natural history and astronomy, all for the use of children from three years old to seven, interwoven with their own little biographies and nursery journals, to the exclusion of *Goody Two Shoes*, as favouring superstition by one party, and of *Jack the Giant Killer* as a suspicious parody on David and Goliath by the other.

'Far, far beyond, where'er my eyeballs stray,
By Lucifer! 'tis all one *milky way*!'

Charles Lamb and Sir Walter Scott agreed in abominating this literature. The former preferred 'wild tales' and the latter Border ballads. When it came to instruction, Sir Walter writes: 'Your ordinary Harry should be kept to his grammar, and your Lucy of most common occurrence will be best employed upon the sampler, instead of wasting wood and cutting their fingers, which I am convinced they did, though their historian says nothing of it.' Again he says: 'There is no great use in teaching children in general to roof houses or build bridges, which, after all, a carpenter or mason does a great deal better at two-and-sixpence a day.'

These remarks were made in criticizing Miss Edgeworth's story of *Harry and Lucy*, and they would be pertinent to many works that have since appeared. But Sir Walter had a proper regard for Miss Edgeworth's talents. She was so very clever, and 'best in the little touches too.' Her *Simple Susan* made him cry.

Miss Edgeworth is, in fact, not merely the first among many who wrote Moral Tales, but she is the first in time

Digitized by Google

among writers of fiction who diligently studied child life. A moralist in grain, she understood that the young might be overbored with good advice, and she made Lady Di Chillingworth a terrible example. She was also a born story-teller, with great gifts for constructing plots which should illustrate the lesson she wished to convey. *Waste not, want not*, for instance, is an admirable tale, and its copybook heading is all that is wanting to save a small boy from believing that with a pennyworth of whipcord he would be made for life. How admirable, too, in the same tale, is Hal—a thorough boy with all a boy's failings duly emphasized. Miss Edgeworth disapproves of him, but disapproves with complete understanding. One who observed so accurately and understood so clearly must have had more sympathy with childish faults than she chose to confess. She had, moreover, a sense of humour that is not to be disguised beneath her formal seriousness, and a moralist with a sense of humour is in touch with humanity.

The morality of Miss Edgeworth was in time to give place to the piety of Evangelical writers. Of these Mrs. Sherwood is easily first. *The Fairchild Family* is a classic. It may be too old-fashioned to appeal to the modern child, but it is a work which grown-up people can re-read with pleasure and profit.

And yet Mrs. Sherwood was not, like Miss Edgeworth, a literary woman. She did not sit down and construct a tale to illustrate a moral or further a theological system. She was just a good woman who looked into her own heart and wrote whatever came into her head. She writes so well because she is so natural. She had a wonderful gift for narrative, and can interest us in the veriest trifles, perhaps because they were not trifles to her. She enjoyed a wider popularity among children than Miss Edgeworth ever had. Miss Edgeworth had studied child life as material for literature. Mrs. Sherwood was a mother only anxious to instruct the children whom she loved.

The stories are told from a mother's point of view. No doubt episodes from her own childhood appear in them, but she is not intent upon interpreting her part; she

Digitized by Google

is anxious for the future of others. She knows children as they are, and she knows how troublesome and how unpleasant they can be. She knows that in the best regulated families children will manifest many evil tendencies; she allows for bad days, and a propensity to romp.

She is quite truthful. Henry steals an apple. He finally repents, but we are told what part fear played in his repentance. Henry has a new story-book. There is a picture of a funeral. 'Oh, how pretty!' says the delighted boy. The children read a story aloud; and as Emily turns a leaf Henry says: 'I know what is coming next; but do make haste, Emily!' Miss Darwell, the rich little girl, offers Henry her Noah's ark, but the children know that they must not receive presents in this way without their mother's consent. Miss Darwell hopes that she will remember to ask Mrs. Fairchild, but confesses that in the bustle of her birthday party she may forget. 'Shall I tell you of it?' says Henry. Henry does not think much of girls in a general way, but in company he is prepared to uphold his sister. 'Emily knows thousands upon thousands of games.' The grandmother Fairchild arrives on a visit. She is to be wheeled about in a chair, and Henry hopes for the honour of being chairman. His first question, in consequence, to the perplexed old lady is: 'May I be your horse?' These and a hundred other little touches shew how thoroughly Mrs. Sherwood is at home in the nursery, and how well she loves the place. When Mrs. Fairchild gives up going to the party because Miss Bessy has ruined her frock and cannot go; when she sets to work, and, what is better, sets Bessy to work to repair the damage; when she does not lecture or scold the careless but heartbroken little girl, we are conscious that we are dealing with a better woman than many of the frivolous writers who find mere amusement in the scrapes of children.

Most bachelors and old maids will put down *The Fairchild Family* with a wish that they could ask Emily, Lucy, and Harry to stay with them. They would love to spoil them. Parents, on the other hand, at the present day

Digitized by Google

will scarcely bring up their children in order to give uncles and aunts that pleasure.

We may pass over *The Wide Wide World*, a book that Bishop Thirlwall could not read, and we would not willingly read again, and pass on to Mrs. Ewing. If the Evangelical Movement produced Mrs. Sherwood, the Tractarian Revival is responsible for Mrs. Ewing. She, like Mrs. Sherwood, was devoted to children, but her outlook was different. She thinks of them always as children of God, and is not in consequence so impressed with the fact that they were born in sin. Both women loved children, both understood them, but one thought first of their faults and how they might be corrected; the other thought first of their innocence and their charm. The one thinks of the future of the children themselves; the other thinks of their influence upon grown-up people. Mrs. Ewing has probably never been so popular in the nursery as Mrs. Sherwood once was; but she has had far more influence on the world outside, and it has been an influence from which children have benefitted.

Mrs. Sherwood could never have written *Daddy Darwin's Dovecot* or *Jan of the Windmill*. She was charitable to the poor, she inculcated charity, but her little masters and misses were kept from the contamination of rude children. The outlook of Mrs. Ewing was wider, her sympathies were not so narrow, she had no class prejudices. She was, moreover, an educationalist with theories. She has done much for the sensible treatment of little girls. Her *Six to Sixteen* is in truth an educational treatise. She made no silly distinctions as to sex; she wanted boys to be pure and girls to be brave.

'In good sooth' (she writes), 'a young maid is all the better for learning some robuster virtues than maidenliness and not to move the antimacassars. And the robuster virtues require some fresh air and freedom. As, on the other hand, Jackanapes (who had a boy's full share of the little beast and the young monkey in his natural composition) was none the worse at his tender years, for learning some maidenliness—so far as maidenliness means decency, pity, unselfishness and pretty behaviour.'

Mrs. Ewing saw people's better qualities without ignoring

Digitized by Google

the bad. She is tender, almost playful, in dealing with frailties which would have shocked Mrs. Sherwood exceedingly. We cannot imagine Mrs. Sherwood writing: 'He was obedient; that is, he did what his great-aunt told him. But—oh dear! oh dear!—the pranks he played which it had never entered into her head to forbid!'

Mrs. Sherwood was not successful in drawing grown-up people. Her books concern the children. Mr. and Mrs. Fairchild had apparently little to do beyond instructing and correcting their offspring. But, for Mrs. Ewing, the home was the centre in which parents and older people held their rightful place, and had their own concerns to attend to. Moreover, she attempts to interpret life truthfully; whereas Mrs. Sherwood is truthful only in the delineation of character. Wishing to persuade children to walk in the paths of righteousness, Mrs. Sherwood shews an inevitable Nemesis pursuing the wrong-doer with a punishment to fit the crime. Mrs. Ewing knows that the wicked often flourish; but she would teach that there are things 'which are beyond all calculation of worldly goods and uses: things such as Love and Honour and the Soul of Man, which cannot be bought with a price, and which do not die with death. And they who fain would live happily *ever* after, should not leave these things out of the lessons of their lives.'

Mrs. Ewing attempted to depict life, but she was not always successful. She never quite learnt her limitations. In *We and the World* she went to sea and got altogether out of her depth; while *A Great Emergency* has been spoilt for many a boy by her feminine inability to understand cricket. Sometimes, too, her tales are so long that she seems to have tired of them herself. Even *Jan of the Windmill* tails off terribly, though the early scenes at the Mill and the description of the Nurse-boy are as good as anything written by George Eliot and more attractive. Mrs. Ewing, however, will live as the author of *Jackanapes* and *Daddy Darwin's Dovecot*. From an artistic point of view they are faultless. They are two of the best short stories in the English language.

Mrs. Ewing also wrote *The Story of a Short Life*, which

Digitized by Google

proved the most popular of her works. It was very pathetic without being mawkish, but it pandered somewhat to the sentimental. Its success encouraged inferior writers to gush about children and to wallow in pathetic situations. The literature about little boys seemed doomed to be drowned in floods of tears, while their admirers chanted elegies full of superfluous adjectives.

From this we were saved by Mr. Kenneth Grahame. His book, *The Golden Age*, reveals new possibilities in the nursery and a new interest in the child. We are carried clean out of the commonplace world of experience and introduced to a small republic composed of children who appreciate *Morte D'Arthur*, and copy Ulysses; who despise the spirit of the age and criticize with humour the conventions of life. And it is all done so naturally that as we read we are convinced. We accept the child in white socks, who writes in a style too good to be called 'precious,' who has 'not reached the disagreeable age when one develops a conscience,' but who is responsive to the voice of Nature, crafty like the beasts who burrow, whose dreams are to be compared with Sagas, and who, with a malevolence far from innocent, can reduce a curate and a lover to confusion. As we read, it seems all quite true; when we reflect, it is a wonderful exhibition of art. How was it done? we ask; but before answering that question let us acknowledge our indebtedness to Mr. Henley who discovered the man who could do it.

Mr. Grahame has set out to interpret the child from within. By an effort of the imagination he has gone back to a time when he was liable to be put in the corner, or held reversed in the air and smacked. Just as a small boy waves a tin sword as he sits a rocking horse while he imagines himself leading a forlorn hope through a hail of bullets; so Mr. Grahame at a desk with a grey goose quill, writing the language of the very *élite*, imagines himself in a sailor suit at war with the Olympians, his elders.

He has listened to the almost inarticulate utterances of children, translated and interpreted them. He has watched their play, their seeming inconsequence, their

Digitized by Google

pretences; and he has divined the meaning. He has memories of that far-off time coloured indeed by the reflections of a later age. He has views about the world as it is, and his humour is to test them from the child's standpoint. He tries to see life as it must appear to a child with his limited experience; and the result is criticism both shrewd and amusing.

But children, though they must very largely live in a world by themselves, have to depend on their elders for other things than the material necessities of life. They are never quite so independent as Mr. Grahame represents them. They have, for instance, a terrible craving to be loved. Neither is it true to suppose that conscience as a rule is a late development. A child has more time to think of conduct than his busy elders. He acts on impulse, but he is inclined to be morbid in his repentance; and he thinks like a judge, especially about the sins of others. Most parents know that one of their great difficulties is the casuistical mind of small offenders; and that is why parents give up reasoning with their children and punish. Again, though we admit to the full all that Mr. Grahame has to teach us about the mental activity and imaginative power of children, we know that few are as purposeful as those in *The Golden Age*. Their adventures are unfinished, their wit lies in sallies, their dreams and romances never come to an end. However, the artist does not copy Nature. His business is to select, to compose, to concentrate what is dissipated, to preserve the essentials; and this Mr. Grahame has done. Lastly, these delightful sketches are like the author's other work in so far as they are 'Pagan Papers.' His children have never 'felt God a moment'; and perhaps for that reason they remain unrelated to the life that we know.

Mr. Pater's *Child in the Home* is frankly an effort of memory and reflection. All grown-up people know how certain incidents, scenes, colours, and words have in childhood been stamped upon the mind, but few have been able to describe them with the same delicate precision. To be so careful of past experience is the splendid economy of the

Digitized by Google

great artist who does not care to mirror the moment, but reflects the impressions only that time cannot efface. Mr. Kenneth Grahame interprets the child from within, Mr. Pater interprets one child—himself; but it is Mr. Stevenson who has best preserved the child-like spirit. He at least never quite grew up.

A Child's Garden of Verses is indeed the greatest achievement from this point of view. It reads as if it might have been written by a boy aged eight. The language, the imagination, the reasoning are alike childlike. The very rhythm seems attuned to little feet that patter and trip. The verses sound best when recited by a clear treble. Even the morals are adapted to the nursery. They are as juvenile as Mrs. Sherwood's *Cautionary Verses*, but what a different spirit they display!

> 'A child should always say what's true,
> And speak when he is spoken to,
> And behave mannerly at table;
> At least as far as he is able.'

Mrs. Sherwood's code did not admit of excuses.

If Mr. Stevenson is most childlike, Mr. Barrie is the most accurate observer of children. *The Little White Bird* is full of humour and kindly sentiment. We should like to visit Kensington Gardens and be introduced to the author's little friends, at any rate when they are not 'Mary-Annish' or 'mad dog.' How truthful is his report of the place. For instance:

'Between the well and the Round Pond are the cricket-pitches, and frequently the choosing of sides exhausts so much time that there is scarcely any cricket. Everybody wants to bat first, and as soon as he is out he bowls, unless you are the better wrestler, and while you are wrestling with him the fielders have scattered to play at something else.'

That appeals to all who have tried to arrange games for children. Either they all want to do the same thing at the same time, or their desires are too diverse to allow them to play at one game. They also sometimes forget what they

Digitized by Google

are playing at, which is very annoying to their elders, but oh! so natural!

Mr. Barrie has indeed shewn how a real intimacy can exist between a man and a little boy. Mr. Kenneth Grahame's hero despised his elders as self-satisfied 'Olympians.' If Mr. Barrie be an 'Olympian,' he is very humble. He knows how much and how little can be expected from a child's sympathy. He is content to lavish his affection and glad to receive any response that is vouchsafed. He is a man and his little friend is going to be one, and herein lies the pathos of the tale. The man sees the shadow of Pilkington all over the garden and knows what it forebodes. The boy looks forward to Pilkington's. He is manly and would be more so. His friend would not have it otherwise, though for him it means loss. Some men love children and some only childhood. Now the love for a child may grow with his growth, but the love of childhood, finding its opportunity in a child, is doomed. The boy puts his hands in his pockets and goes whistling off to a Private School. A child he will be no more.

In *The Noisy Years*, Mrs. Dearmer deals with a similar problem. How is a young mother to live on terms with two little monkeys in a small flat? Mr. Barrie's experiences were all out of doors, and after all he was not responsible. Mrs. Dearmer's mother lives at home, and bears up under her responsibilities as best she may. She is very successful: she can see the amusing side of much that is inconvenient and can laugh through her tears, a purely feminine virtue. Her little boys are as charming as their mother, and we would ask Mr. Kenneth Grahame to study the conscience of Robin. It is well worth the trouble.

We should also like to introduce to the family in *The Golden Age* the Bastable children, who appear in two volumes by Mrs. Nesbit, *Oswald Bastable* and *The Treasure Seekers*. They might not have agreed very well; and it is even possible that they might have destroyed one another. And yet Mrs. Nesbit has great gifts in dealing with children. She can forgive their noisy and assertive ways. She can record without comment their actions. In fact, she puts their

Digitized by Google

adventures into the mouth of Oswald Bastable—a voluble young gentleman entirely self-satisfied, with an irritating habit of talking of himself in the third person. He writes as a boy for boys; and boys are likely to appreciate him. He belongs not to an ancient home with Blue Rooms and deserted boudoirs: Oswald Bastable thrives in the suburbs, and is not much given to dreaming. His energy never tires; his very morality is assertive. He and his brothers and sisters are all of them fresh, and healthy with a super-abundance of life. Their adventures merit narration, but we sometimes suspect the truthful Oswald of exaggerating just a little, as boys will. And Oswald's attitude towards his elders is interesting. It is that of the modern child. What Mrs. Sherwood would have thought of it we tremble to imagine; but here in black and white is his testimonial to the virtues of Mrs. Bax.

'We had only discovered her true nature three days ago, and already she had taken us out in a sailing-boat and in a motor car, had given us sweets every day, and taught us eleven new games that we had not known before; and only four of the new games were rotten. How seldom can as much be said for the games of a grown-up, however gifted! . . . There are points about having a grown-up with you if it is of the right kind. You can then easily get it to say "yes" to what you want, and after that if anything goes wrong it is their fault, and you are pure from blame.'

Grown-ups like to read about Oswald, but few would care to invite the Bastables on a lengthy visit. The prudent man would ask the Fairchild Family to stay with him, and the Bastables to meet them for one afternoon with the children out of *The Golden Age*. Then he would take the nameless hero of Mr. Kenneth Grahame for a walk on the Roman Road and discuss life until it was imperative to return and pick up the bits. The modern child can be very exacting and selfish; and he is not always quite so high-minded as Oswald Bastable reports himself as being.

In Mrs. Allen Harker's books we are glad to find ourselves once more in a home with wholesome nursery discipline. *The Romance of a Nursery* and *Concerning Paul and Fiam-*

Digitized by Google

metta, both deal with the same family, dwelling amid the Cotswolds in 'a haunt of ancient peace.' The former tale is spoilt by a melodramatic close; but the latter is quite delightful. Modern children are again represented—happy children always getting into and out of scrapes, but they are civilized. In these tales, too, we find a father who does not lecture but is always ready to help; a mother who does not fuss but does control; and a home that is beautiful and charming as the life which is there enjoyed. The stories are put into the mouth of Janey, 'a ripping girl,' as her brother calls her. She lives the outdoor life, she cultivates the robuster virtues, she would even learn to box; but we never forget she is a maiden, and a very sweet little maiden too.

Fiammetta, on the other hand, is the only child of a Poet who lives a Bohemian life. She has been brought up in a variety of foreign hotels; she has the artistic temperament; and the stories relate to a long visit that she pays to the home of her cousins. Of course, Fiammetta is charming, of course she attracts attention, but her little friend who keeps herself in the background is the child we would know more about.

It would be interesting to compare what we have learnt from these many and very varied writers, to note where Mrs. Sherwood is corroborated by Mr. Barrie, and Mr. Stevenson and Mrs. Harker disagree. For that we have no space, but after the old fashion of children's books we would draw a moral at the close. A century ago parents regarded children as potential men and women and were a little too eager to force their development. Nowadays children are regarded as charming, everyone is kind to them, everyone is tolerant, but we tend to forget that they have a future, and that childhood passes away.

To study childhood is one thing, to train a child quite another, and children need to be trained, and were not merely intended for our amusement. The first years of life are indeed most important. 'Give me a child up to seven, and I care not who has him afterwards,' said a saga-

Digitized by Google

cious Jesuit. After reading many of these children's books the necessity of enforcing parental responsibility becomes apparent. We do not want mechanical morals; we do not want primness and suppression. We do want homes like those described by Mrs. Ewing and Mrs. Allen Harker.

ART. VIII.—THE NEW THEOLOGY.

1. *The New Theology.* By R. J. CAMPBELL, M.A., Minister of the City Temple, London. Fifth Impression. (London : Chapman & Hall, Limited, 1907.)
2. *What about the New Theology?* By W. L. WALKER. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1907.)
3. *The British Weekly.* Art. *The Newest Theology.* By P. T. FORSYTH, D.D., March 7, 1907. Art. *The New Theology,* March 21, 1907. Art. *God, Sin and the Atonement,* March 28, 1907. Art. *Pantheism and the Churches,* April 4, 1907. (London : Hodder & Stoughton.)

EVERY thoughtful person will recognize that, while the Christian Creed is always the same, Christian theology is always changing. This is right and natural. The Christian Creed enshrines a Divine revelation. It tells us of knowledge given to man of that which transcends experience, and it is held to-day, as it always has been, with an unanimity that is remarkable. It is the fashion to be dwelling continually on the divisions of Christians and the differences of opinion which prevail. Those who do so seem to forget that substantially on the great subject of the contents of the Creed all existing bodies of Christians are at one. All alike—Roman, Orthodox, Anglican, Protestant, so long as they claim to be orthodox—can express their belief in the terms of the Creed promulgated at Chalcedon. But while the Christian belief is and always has been one, Christian theology is infinitely varied, because it is the interpretation of that belief in human language, in the language adapted to each age and country. The thought of Athanasius was very different from that of Augustine. East and West

Digitized by Google

think very differently. The man brought up on the scholastic philosophy cannot express his ideas in the same way as the pupil of Darwin. To each the Creed must be interpreted in a way that he can understand. More than that, each will have something to give to the comprehension of the Christian faith. We know more of what Christianity means each time a new system of philosophy comes to assist in interpreting it.

When, then, we are told of a 'New Theology,' although our remembrance of the humble spirit of the greatest theologians will make us resent the title, we do not consider it necessary to condemn it beforehand. If theology were not always becoming new the Christian Church would be failing in its work. We recognize that in the face of the problems of the present day old truths require restatement. Science, evolution, psychology, Biblical criticism, all raise questions which demand an answer. Nor, again, are we especially enamoured of a great deal of the theology of the Reformation. We certainly hold no brief for the particular religious opinions against which Mr. Campbell's teaching is a protest; hence we do not approach the examination of his new doctrines with any feeling of prejudice. That anyone should revolt against a great deal of the traditional teaching of the City Temple seems to us an entirely healthy sign. We are therefore anxious to consider what he has to say, certainly without prejudice, and perhaps with some feelings of sympathy. But we are afraid that the result of our reading has been to change our sympathy into protest. We have seldom read a theological work which professed to be part of a revolution of religious thought which has been to us more repellent. We do not quarrel with Mr. Campbell so much because he has the tricks of the popular preacher, because he is strangely ignorant both of theology and philosophy—a state of mind which is not uncommon among those who profess to be leaders of thought. That he despises what he does not know is equally natural. We might pardon all these things, but we cannot pardon—and we say it with the utmost seriousness—the irreverent parodies of popular religious thought that disfigure the work.

Digitized by Google

They are as futile from the point of view of argument as they are unworthy of serious theology. It is quite easy to make any form of opinion appear to look ridiculous by stating it in a ridiculous way. It shocks every reverent mind, and it does not help the cause of truth. So strongly do we feel this that we should in many ways have been inclined to pass the book over in complete silence, but it is clear that the difficulties which have caused Mr. Campbell to build up what seems to us so inadequate a theology are felt probably in just the same crude form by many other persons, and we think that it may be useful to try not so much to criticize Mr. Campbell—for that has, we think, been done sufficiently—as to attempt to unravel these difficulties. We shall therefore banish as much as possible from our minds the defects of the work, and address ourselves to the different questions which Mr. Campbell raises.

I.

The main purpose of *The New Theology* is described in the following words:

'What is wanted is a restatement of the essential truth of the Christian religion in terms of the modern mind. Where or when the name New Theology arose I do not know, but it has been in existence for at least one generation. . . . It has long been in use . . . to indicate the attitude of those who believe that the fundamentals of the Christian faith need to be rearticulated in terms of the immanence of God.'

Certain intellectual difficulties have, in the opinion of Mr. Campbell, made this necessary. He is defining the meaning of God, and he writes as follows:

'So far science has only succeeded in giving us a vaster, grander conception of God, by giving us a vaster, grander conception of the universe in which we live. When I say God, I mean the mysterious Power which is finding expression in the universe, and which is present in every tiniest atom of the wondrous whole. I find that this Power is the one reality I cannot get away from, for, whatever else it may be, it is myself. Theologians will tell me that I have taken a prodigious leap

Digitized by Google

in saying this, but I cannot help it. How can there be anything in the universe outside of God? Whatever distinctions of being there may be within the universe, it is surely clear that they must all be transcended and comprehended within infinity. There cannot be two infinities, nor can there be an infinite and also a finite beyond it. What infinity may be we have no means of knowing. Here the most devout Christian is just as much of an agnostic as Professor Huxley; we can predicate nothing with confidence concerning the all-comprehending unity wherein we live and move and have our being, save and except as we see it manifested in that part of our universe which lies open to us. One would think that this were so obvious as to need no demonstration. But how do ordinary church-going Christians talk about God? They talk as though He were (practically) a finite being, stationed somewhere above and beyond the universe, watching and worrying over other and lesser finite beings—to wit, ourselves. According to the received phraseology, this God is greatly bothered and thwarted by what men have been doing throughout the few millenniums of human existence. He takes the whole thing very seriously, and thinks about little else than getting wayward humanity into line again. To this end He has adopted various expedients, the chief of which was the sending of His only-begotten Son to suffer and die in order that He might be free to forgive the trouble we had caused Him.'

We have quoted this passage because it is thoroughly characteristic both of the style and of the confusion of thought of the writer. It is very interesting to find ourselves back again in the old difficulties of the Gnostic. How can the Infinite become finite? How can God, who is all, create anything? This is the old question which perplexed so many dreamers in the second century, and produced those wonderful systems of speculative Gnosticism which have very much in common with Mr. Campbell's theology—systems which were really attempts, just as his is, to express Christianity in the terms of Divine immanence. But Mr. Campbell and the Gnostics alike have fallen into the fashion of arguing from words as if they understood what they meant. He says quite rightly that we have no means of knowing what infinity is. If that be the case

Digitized by Google

how can we argue about what the Infinite God can or cannot do? That is the whole root of the difficulty. Every mathematician knows that if you introduce infinity into a problem you can arrive at very strange results. So it is in language. We call God Infinite[1] because we have no other way of expressing what we mean, but, as Mr. Campbell himself says, we do not know what infinity means. We can only think of it as unlimited, and it is just as hard for us to think of the unlimited as it is to think of the limited. As has been well put, the infinite is only a concept of the mind. Mr. Campbell, like many other thinkers, has argued about it as if it represented a reality. When we deny the possibility of God having created the universe because we cannot understand how the Infinite became finite we are simply limiting the Divine power by our own mental conceptions. It would be more correct to say not that God is unlimited, but that He is self-limited. The whole question is discussed, we think, very well by Dr. Strong.

'The question of infinity is more serious. It seems to involve a real limitation upon the infinity of God, that He should fix definite laws for created existence and allow a thought to take shape, as it were, outside Himself in an independent fashion. . . .

'It is true, that if the desire arose from without, and was caused, as in the case of men, by some change occurring independently of the subject of it, such a position would be in contradiction with the idea of Infinity. But it is quite different if the desire depends solely upon the will of the Infinite, and if the realization of it, even though it may involve limitation, is self-chosen. It is quite possible that Creation may mean in some sense a self-limitation on the part of God, though we cannot fully understand in what sense. But it will be remembered that in the last chapter we quoted an ancient doctrine mentioned by St. Irenæus, that the nature of God is self-limiting; the Father, writes St. Irenæus, is unmeasured, the Son is the measure of the Father. And we cannot but think that this thought is far truer, we believe, and more suitable to the notion

[1] It may be noticed that the Anglican Articles (in which the language is carefully chosen) do not speak of God as 'infinite,' but as 'of infinite power, wisdom and goodness'—which is a very different thing.

Digitized by Google

of God than the popular epithet infinite. This word is purely negative in its associations; it means literally nothing but the absence of all limits. And there is nothing in it to show that it does not include the absence of all positive existence. . . .

'What we desire to affirm is, that neither finite nor infinite has any proper meaning apart from the idea of quantity, and that this is out of place in speaking of personal life. On the other hand, the idea of self-limitation has none of the disadvantages of these two terms, finite and infinite. It is applicable to a personal being, and all the meaning it has is permeated through and through with the notion of personality. It may be employed with reference to any act in which a personal being decisively expresses himself, and it wholly avoids the contradiction between definite action and the so-called infinity of the Divine Being. It is exactly the expression best suited for describing action, and in the present application of it, it shows us Creation as in harmony with the revealed nature of God.'[1]

Mr. Campbell's difficulties, then, like those of many others, have come, we believe, from his first saying that God is Infinite, a word which has no real relation to things and only expresses the limitation of our intellect, and then limiting His power by the epithet he has given Him. Surely it is wiser to keep the old term 'Almighty.' To deny that God can create new things is to limit His power. Grant Him to be Almighty, All-powerful, and this limitation is obviously a contradiction. Between All-powerful and Infinite let Mr. Campbell choose—for choose he must—which is the Christian conception admits of no doubt.

But Mr. Campbell's differs from the Christian conception in another and a deeper way. His conception of God is not the Christian conception: it is a Greek conception, a philosophic conception; it is one which gives another name to the 'unconscious force' of the materialist; but the very essence of the Christian conception is that God is personal. Its root is the Hebrew conception of 'Jehovah, exalted in righteousness.' The Christian believes in a personal and a moral God, not an unmoral

[1] *A Manual of Theology*, by T. B. Strong, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. Second edition, pp. 192–194 (A. & C. Black, 1903).

Digitized by Google

force. That all such language is of course difficult, that it is inadequate, we recognize; that the term personal can only be explained by human analogy and represents but a part of the truth, all this we admit. But the essence of the whole Christian revelation as regards the nature of the Godhead begins with the belief that God is our Father. This, according to Professor Harnack, was the great truth which our Lord came to reveal to us, this is the dogma behind the simplest prayer of the little child, without this thought religion has no meaning. And it is just because, in the words which we have quoted, Mr. Campbell implicitly denies the Fatherhood of God that the whole of his superstructure is valueless. It is because, as Christ has revealed to us, God does care for a man and '*is bothered*' about man (if we may repeat these very irreverent words) that we pray to Him, that we worship Him, that we love Him. What does our Lord say?

'Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?'

'Why are ye anxious concerning raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?'

'Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father: but the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows.'

II.

We pass on to ask what is the relation of man to God? And here we find Mr. Campbell somewhat frightened of pursuing the course on which he has started to its logical conclusion. We do not blame him for this. We think that if he had done so his theology and philosophy would be worse than it is, but our difficulty is that he seems to

Digitized by Google

try to get all the credit of being a consistent Monist and yet to deny the accusation. This is what he writes:

'The ultimate Self of the universe is God. The New Testament speaks of man as body, soul, and spirit. The body is the thought-form through which the individuality finds expression on our present limited plane; the soul is a man's consciousness of himself as apart from all the rest of existence, and even from God—it is the bay seeing itself as the bay, and not as the ocean; the spirit is the true being thus limited and expressed—it is the deathless Divine within us. The soul, therefore, is what we make it; the spirit we can neither make nor mar, for it is at once our being and God's. What we are here to do is to grow the soul—that is, to manifest the true nature of the spirit, to build up that self-realization which is God's objective with the universe as a whole, and with every self-conscious unit in particular.

'Where, then, someone will say, is the dividing line between our being and God's? There is no dividing line except from our side. . . . But, the reader may protest, this is Pantheism. No, it is not. "Pantheism" is a technical term in philosophic parlance, and means something quite different from this. It stands for a Fate-God, a God imprisoned in His universe, a God who cannot help Himself, and does not even know what He is about, a blind force which here breaks out into a rock and there into Ruskin, and is equally indifferent to either. But that is not my God. My God is my deeper Self, and yours too; He is the Self of the universe, and knows all about it. He is never baffled, and cannot be baffled; the whole cosmic process is one long incarnation and uprising of the being of God from itself to itself. With Tennyson you can call this doctrine the Higher Pantheism, if you like; but it is the very antithesis of the Pantheism which has played such a part in the history of thought.'

Now we quite admit that Mr. Campbell does not wish to teach Pantheism; our difficulty is that we do not know how, starting with the premises that he does, he can save himself from such a conclusion. If we are God, God realizing Himself, and if everything good and evil is God, because there cannot be anything outside God, and if God is the force and power of the universe and is only expressed in the

Digitized by Google

universe, and if we are also a part of the universe—and all this Mr. Campbell, so far as we can see, asserts—those who have logically gone further and taught Pantheism in its complete form seem to us to be consistent thinkers, while Mr. Campbell is not. Throughout he tells us that he wishes to shew that Christianity is really moral, and not immoral as the old theology would make out, but he has in reality taken away the whole possibility of morality as it is commonly understood. He goes on to admit his want of logical consistency, for he says that you cannot defend free will logically, and yet somehow he feels that there must be room for something that would be free will. This shews that his logical conclusion is unsound; does it not suggest to him that his premises are insufficient?

Let us try and state the lines on which we believe that the solution should be attained. Science, law, Pantheism, whatever you will, are simply the interpretation of part of our experience, our experience of the external world; but we have another experience, far more real, far more true even than our knowledge of the external world—viz. our knowledge of ourself as a cause. The whole of human life and human thought, of society, of legislation, is based upon the idea that the individual is a free cause. There are two elements in the experience of every man, and no philosophy is adequate which does not recognize both. Our experience is double: the experience of our own consciousness, the Ego, and the experience of that outside our consciousness, the world. Any system which is true to life and provides a basis of life must be true to both those experiences. Christianity puts before us three great entities—the world, myself, and, as the explanation of both, God. It assumes the reality of each of them; it gives a reasonable hypothesis for both my life and my experience. It makes me a moral being, and therefore it forms a reasonable basis of conduct. Mr. Campbell's philosophy in which ultimate distinctions have disappeared, whether we call it Pantheism or, as he prefers it, a Monistic idealism, does not. He wishes, as we shall see, to establish a sound basis of moral action, but we fail ourselves to find it in his teaching.

Digitized by Google

III.

There is no part of Mr. Campbell's theory which has laid itself open to more criticism than his treatment of the problem of sin. Some of the criticism may not be quite fair to Mr. Campbell's own opinions, as passages have been quoted apart from their context. But if we save his character as a preacher, we can hardly preserve it as a philosopher. It will be most convenient to quote different views which he expresses.

'Evil is a negative, not a positive term. It denotes the absence rather than the presence of something. It is the perceived privation of good, the shadow where the light ought to be. "The devil is a vacuum," as a friend of mine once remarked to the no small bewilderment of a group of listeners, in whose imagination the devil was anything but a vacuum. Evil is not an intruder in an otherwise perfect universe; finiteness presumes it. A thing is only seen to be evil when the capacity for good is present and unsatisfied. Evil is not a principle at war with good. Good is being, and evil is not-being. When consciousness of being seeks further expression, and finds itself hindered by its limitations, it becomes aware of evil.'

Here then we have reminiscences of Plato, the Platonic theory of good as being, and evil as not-being. We pass to a second quotation:

'What you are seeking, young man, is more abundant life, and that is equivalent to seeking God. Life *is* God. "Every good and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." And when the tendency goes round and works havoc and ruin in the world, it still remains a quest for God, although a blundering one. It is a misuse of Divine energy. The man who got drunk last night and gratified his lower nature in that delirious hour would be surprised if you were to tell him, when you see the result, that he was really seeking God; but so it is. He wants life, and thinks he can get it this way. This is the reason why morbid excitement and the craving for amusement have such power in human lives to-day. Your *roué* in Piccadilly, who went out to destroy innocence, was seeking life while spreading death. It seems

Digitized by Google

almost blasphemy to say it, but he was seeking God, and thinking —O woeful blunder!—that he would find Him by destroying something that God has made beautiful and fair.'

Here the Pantheist is speaking, and Mr. Campbell's reasoning is quite logical. If God is everything and if I am a part of God, then everything I do must be a part of Him, and it becomes difficult on any logical grounds to find a basis for any theory of sin. Now let us turn to a third quotation:

'It is time we had done with unreal talk about sin. Sin is the murder-spirit in human experience. "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" Strong language; but I suppose the man who first used it must have known what he was talking about. Pomposity is sin, because it is egoism; self-complacency and contemptuousness are sin for the same reason. Cupidity is sin, whether in a burglar or in a doctor of divinity. A bitter, grasping, cruel, unsympathetic spirit is sin, no matter who shows it. The scribe and the Pharisee are too much with us, and the religious ideal needs to be rescued from their blighting grasp to-day as much as ever it did. Of all forms of sin, an arrogant, malignant, self-satisfied assumption of righteousness is the worst and the hardest to eradicate.'

And so on. Here it is the Christian preacher who is speaking, and even though we do not consider that Mr. Campbell covers the whole of the ground when he tells us that sin is selfishness, we entirely concur with his denunciation of the love of self in every class and every society. But after we have passed all these three extracts in review (and they are each typical of things Mr. Campbell often says) we remain more than ever in difficulties as to what Mr. Campbell's theory of evil really is. Are we to take him as a Platonist and say that evil is not-being? Or are we to take him as a Pantheist and say that there is really no such thing as evil at all? Or are we to take him as a Christian teacher and listen to his eloquent denunciations of wickedness in the world? And if, as he tells us, the world is an experiment without the

Digitized by Google

risk of failure, how does it come about that whether in the world or in the Church there are such innumerable signs of failure, such terrible instances of incapacity to reach the ideal—that there is so much sin and misery and selfishness in the world? We venture to think that thoughtful persons will hardly feel that Mr. Campbell's 'New Theology' has made much advance in solving the problem of the universe.

Let us examine further some of the causes of Mr. Campbell's difficulties. Throughout, as one would expect, difficulties about the Fall assume a very prominent place. The whole Christian doctrine of sin, in his opinion, is the result of mistaken ideas about the Fall.

'The theological muddle is largely caused by the inability of many people to free themselves from archaic notions which have really nothing to do with Christianity, although they have been imported into it. The principal of these, in relation to the question of sin, is the doctrine of the Fall. This doctrine has played a mischievous part in Christian thought, more especially, perhaps, since the Reformation.'

Now we can quite understand that a reaction from teaching about 'total depravity' and such similar language may lead to very unfair and prejudiced criticism, but what Mr. Campbell, and so many critics like him, fail to see is that the fact of sin, and the whole Christian doctrine about sin and Atonement, are quite apart from and independent of any particular doctrine concerning the Fall. The theology of the Fall hardly appears in the Old Testament. It has left hardly any traces, if any at all, in the Gospels, and if anyone will read attentively the Epistle to the Romans he will see that there, too, the whole argument is entirely independent of the passage about the Fall. The basis of St. Paul's teaching is not the Fall of Man but the fact of sin: this he proves both objectively, by the state of the existing world at the time when he wrote, and subjectively by his personal and religious experience. Because a righteous God must feel wrath against sin, therefore salvation is necessary for mankind, and whether the story of the

Digitized by Google

Book of Genesis be a historical fact or an allegory that argument will still hold good. St. Paul's idea about the Fall only appears in two places, both very obscure, and the logical connexion with the rest of his doctrine is that the story of the Fall embodies a theory of the origin of sin. It does not explain sin, because sin is something that exists.

At the present time there is, and there is rightly, a reaction against some of the extremer forms of the Reformation doctrine. Both Biblical criticism and the study of ethnology make it impossible for most people to believe in the story of the Fall as a historical fact. A one-sided conception of the meaning of evolution makes a large number of people desire to construct a theory of life which shall have no place in it for any fall in man. But none of these changes in thought and none of these theories do away with the actual facts which have made people in the past believe in sin, and which led to such speculations as those concerning the origin of evil. No theory of evolution can explain away facts, and the fact is this—that man, so far as we can see, alone amongst created beings has the gift of conscious knowledge of right and wrong, the power of choosing right and rejecting wrong, and that he has often chosen the wrong and rejected the right. The result of this has been that state of mankind which we call sinful, which is attacked by so many preachers in such vigorous language, by none more so than by Mr. Campbell. There may have been—probably there is—exaggeration in the Christian language and the Christian preaching, as there is in the language of the Stoic philosopher. It is possible to take a perverted view of the condition of mankind; but the fact remains that this phenomenon which we call sin, this failure to attain the ideal, is a characteristic of human life, and no philosophy which fails to take it into account is in the least adequate as a theory of the universe. And our knowledge about sin is not confined to what we see. It is a fact of our own personal experience. We know that we have a conscience which tells us what is right and what is wrong. We know that we can blur and destroy that conscience as we can blur and destroy other gifts. We know that we

Digitized by Google

constantly think and desire to do what is clearly, as our conscience tells, not right: that there is a struggle and that, unless we are victorious in this struggle, the tendency to do wrong will increase. We feel that we are ourselves in revolt against something which is higher; that if we have an ideal it may very likely help us to do what is right. We inevitably put sin in antithesis to righteousness and to God. The theologians tell us that sin in its essence is a revolt against righteousness, which is God. Here, as elsewhere, no doubt we are using what the Dean of Westminster has called 'the language of necessarily imperfect symbolism,' but at any rate we feel that the Christian theory explains and accounts for the facts and forms a basis for a higher morality, that it has made possible the moral progress of the world. We feel that Mr. Campbell's theory affords no explanation of the facts of life, and no basis for the ethical teaching which, as he so constantly reminds us, is the only part of Christianity which is to him of any value.

IV.

We do not know that it is necessary for us to dwell at very great length on Mr. Campbell's theory about the Person of our Lord. Like so many teachers of his character he begins, as we expect, by a somewhat conventional eulogy of the Founder of Christianity, which is couched in that patronizing phraseology which seems to be popular.

'It is no use trying to place Jesus in a row along with other religious masters. He is first and the rest nowhere; we have no category for Him. I am not trying to prove the impossible, namely, that Christianity is the only true religion and the rest are all false. We shall get on better when that kind of nonsense ceases to be spoken.'

The rest of his discussion on this subject is devoted to reasserting the traditional language of Christianity with quite a different meaning, and the distinction between his teaching and the ordinary Christian doctrine is fundamental. Traditional Christianity, following the teaching

Digitized by Google

of St. Paul and the New Testament, tells us in Mr. Campbell's words that

'The second person in the Trinity, who was co-equal and co-eternal with God the Father, laid aside His glory, became incarnate for our salvation, was born of a virgin, lived a brief, suffering life, wrought many miracles, died a shameful death, rose again from the tomb on the second morning after He had been laid in it, and ascended into Heaven in full view of His wondering disciples.'

Of this and similar doctrines he tells us:

'There is a sense in which all this is true, but it is commonly expressed in such a way that the truth is lost sight of. Literally understood, it is incredible. The only way to get at the truth in every one of these venerable articles of the Christian faith will be to shed the husk, and that we must do without hesitation or compromise.'

A restatement of this doctrine begins by telling us that though we can speak of the Divinity of Christ we cannot speak of the Deity. Christ's personality was Divine because it was the one life which consistently and from first to last was lived in the terms of the whole, and therefore was Divine. But 'in a sense, everything that exists is Divine,' though 'it can hardly be seriously contended that a crocodile is as much an expression of God as General Booth.' 'General Booth is Divine in so far as love is the governing principle of his life. Jesus was Divine simply and solely because His life was never governed by any other principle.' 'The Jesus of history did not possess the consciousness of Deity during His life on earth. His consciousness was as purely human as our own.' According to theologians Christ 'assumed human nature, but He was eternally Divine before He did so,' and there is no need 'to refute this argument; the trend of modern thought is already doing so most effectually.' This 'is not Unitarianism,' because Unitarianism 'has been just as prone to dualism as the extremist Trinitarianism.' Christ is Divine because man is Divine.

Side by side with this definition of the Person of our

Digitized by Google

Lord, which makes Him represent the Divine in man, we have a further doctrine of the Eternal Christ. 'Jesus is the fullest expression of that eternal Divine man on the field of human history'; there is 'the archetypal eternal Divine Man, the source and sustenance of the universe, and yet transcending the universe.' 'The idea of a Divine Man, the emanation of the infinite, the Soul of the universe, the source and goal of all humanity, is ages older than Christian theology. . . . It is a true, indeed an inevitable, conception, if we hold anything like a consistent view of the immanence of God in His universe. With what God have we to do except the God who is eternally man?' This is 'the eternal Christ.' 'According to the New Testament writers Jesus was and is the Christ, but in His earthly life His consciousness of the fact was limited. But, as we have come forth from this fontal manhood, we too must be to some extent expressions of this eternal Christ. . . . Fundamentally our being is already one with that of the eternal Christ, and faith in Jesus is faith in Him.'

It hardly seems necessary to give more illustrations of Mr. Campbell's teaching. As we read his words we seem to hear strange reminiscences of teaching of long ago. We have already shewn how the problems that beset Mr. Campbell were the same problems as those of the Gnostics of old. It is the same in his doctrine of free will, the same in his difficulty with regard to the existence of evil, the same in his doctrine of the Person of Christ. Here we have just the separation of Jesus and the Christ which we find in Valentinus. Here again we have Christianity stated in the language of a decadent Pantheism.

We are quite sure that Mr. Campbell does not represent what the Church has taught, what the Bible teaches, or what we believe to be true; but we should like to ask one further question. Is what he teaches any easier for us to believe at the present day than what the Church teaches? Is it easier to believe in 'a Divine man, the emanation of the infinite, the Soul of the universe?' The language is unreal, mystical. It has no authority, it does not come to us with authority, it has no evidence

Digitized by Google

in its favour. It may attract a few minds, as Theosophy and mysticism always have attracted certain minds, but it is so unreal, so untrue to the facts of life and experience, with its perversion—we can call it nothing else—of Christianity that it will not be a Gospel for the age. Here, as elsewhere, Mr. Campbell has perverted and distorted Christian truth. Christianity has always taught us that Christ was God and the Son of God, and it was because He was God that He was able to reveal human nature in its ideal aspect; and so 'because He became man He made it possible that we should become God.' *Αὐτὸς ἐνηνθρώπησεν ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν*, as said Athanasius. We are able, we believe, to attain to what is the ideal and the goal of our nature, not merely because He is the same as we are, in that He has taken our nature upon Him, but because He is different from us. By that Divine nature of His He is able to represent humanity as it should be, not as it is. It does not help us to attain our ideal by protesting that humanity is what it is not.

V.

Mr. Campbell's treatment of the doctrine of the Atonement is very characteristic. He begins, as we might naturally expect, by a statement of the Christian doctrine of the Atonement similar in character to his statement concerning other Christian doctrines. It is needless to say that it is a caricature of what is taught. The conventional doctrine of the Atonement, as he calls it, is stripped of everything which makes it both ethical and real, and is then attacked for being un-ethical. But the crude view which is here imputed to theologians has never been taught by any theologian of any merit from the Reformation onwards. It is sometimes a fashion to criticize, and criticize severely, Luther's statements about the Atonement, not as Luther expounded them but as it is assumed that he expounded them. But it will be found that he never taught the doctrine in the crude way which is ascribed to him. What we often consider to be in him only forensic was corrected by a strong element of mysticism,

Digitized by Google

and he, as much as his critics at the present day, thought that the Atonement was not only done for us but done in us.

Further, Mr. Campbell wishes it to be quite clear that the Bible is not the place in which to obtain our knowledge of what the Atonement means; in fact, there is no theory of the Atonement in the New Testament.

'The Pauline, Petrine, and Johannine theories, and that of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are not mutually consistent, and Paul is not always consistent with himself.'

'At present Paul's opinion on this great subject is by many people supposed to be decisive. Paul says this, and Paul says that, and when Paul has spoken there is no more to be said. But why should it be so? Paul's opinion is simply Paul's opinion, and not necessarily a complete and adequate statement of truth. It is entitled to be considered weighty because it is the utterance of a great man, and a great seer of truth, as well as being the earliest writing on the subject which we possess. Any man of the moral and intellectual eminence of Paul is entitled to reverence when he speaks, whether his views are in the Bible or not.'

When we come to Mr. Campbell's opinion, we find in his exposition of the Atonement, if we content ourselves with his positive statements, a great deal that we could gladly and willingly accept. As this is the best part of Mr. Campbell's work we will quote a somewhat lengthy passage:

'It should now be plain why the doctrine of the Atonement has been so closely associated with the doing away of sin; it is because, as we have seen, the root-idea of Atonement is the assertion of the fundamental oneness of man with man and all with God. Sin is the divisive, separating thing in our relations with one another, and with God the source of all, so the assertion of our oneness involves getting rid of sin. If we ask how this is to be done, the answer is simple enough: the only way to get rid of selfishness is by the ministry of love. What is it that is slowly winning the world from its selfishness to-day, and lifting it gradually into the higher, purer atmosphere of universal love? There is but one thing that is doing it, and that is the spirit of self-sacrifice. Wherever you see that, you see the true Atonement at work. There can be no doubt about

Digitized by Google

the final issue, for behind the spirit of love is infinity, whereas the spirit of selfishness is essentially finite. On the field of human history the death of Jesus is the focus and concentrated essence of this age-long atoning process, whereby selfishness is being overcome, and the whole race lifted up to its home in God. Until Jesus came, no self-offering had been so consistent and so complete. No selfish desire could find lodgment in His pure soul. He showed men the ideal life by living it Himself—the life which was perfectly at one with God and man. In a selfish world that life was sure to end on a Calvary of some kind, but the very fact that it did so demonstrated the completeness of its victory over all considerations of self-interest. Selfishness lost the battle by seeming to gain it. God was behind the life of Jesus just because it was the life of perfect love, the life which was a perfect gift to the whole; therefore that life immediately arose in power in other lives, and has gone on increasing its benevolent sway over human hearts ever since. This is the Atonement, and it is rightly associated with the cross of Jesus in the minds of men, for the cross is the sum and centre of it all.'

All this is very true and it is admirably put; but why and how has the world, if not Mr. Campbell, learnt it? It has learnt it through the continuous, recurring influence of the belief in the reality of the Atonement by the Son of God, and through the continuous study of the writings of the New Testament. The human race did not discover this unaided; it came to them through the revelation in Christ as interpreted in the New Testament. That revelation has taught us something profoundly different and on a different plane and level from anything which other books have taught us: while they have presented what is incomplete, it presents what is complete. We can read the whole history of the development of the idea of sacrifice from the earliest ethnic systems; we can see how the old crude ideas were, under the influence of Jewish Monotheism, idealized and purified until they have taught men the deep and profound lessons of union with God, of the need of atonement for sin, of the offering to God of all that is highest and best in us. We can see the time come when this system begins to break down, when people

Digitized by Google

still needing atonement ask, Can the blood of bullocks and goats really cleanse from sin? Then in a world yearning for sacrifice, but doubting about sacrifice, comes the life of Jesus which exhibits a life of perfect sacrifice on earth, ending with an heroic death. The disciples of Jesus, guided by His own words, interpreted this life in the light of the prophetic and sacrificial teaching of the Old Testament which they knew so well and which we know so imperfectly. Everything that that sacrificial system had claimed to do His death had done. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, His death was the original of which the sacrifices were the copy and shadow. The whole language of the sacrificial system might therefore be transferred to Christ, not by way of metaphor but by way of reality. The sacrifices were the metaphor, the shadow—the death of Christ was the reality. But why was this sacrifice so different from other sacrifices? Because it was a sacrifice of will, because it was self-sacrifice, because it revealed the love of God for man, because it shewed what God was in His real Nature. But were the life and death of Christ merely a sort of drama, enacted to give an instance of heroic self-sacrifice to men, or was it merely an act of human heroism? Both these suggestions are thrown out nowadays, but neither would account for the power of the Atonement, or enable us to feel that the teaching was real. As Mr. Walker puts it—we are glad to quote his book—

'It was always the Cross on which Christ died, in some real sense, *because of our sins and for our salvation.* Is it necessary to seek to reduce it to some set formula? I do not think so. We should inevitably omit something, or perhaps bring in something of our own merely. Better to stand reverently in the presence of that Cross. The Cross of the Sinless in a world of sin speaks for itself, and, in spite of all denials, it will continue to speak to the consciences of men. It is enough to say that the Cross on which Christ "tasted death for every man" was the Divinely appointed means whereby God's forgiving Love went forth to men so as to save them from sin and self, and therefore also from the consequences of the merely self-centred life.'[1]

[1] W. L. Walker, *What about the New Theology?* p. 197.

Digitized by Google

The point we wish to emphasize is that the lesson mankind has learnt from the Cross of Christ it has learnt because it felt that, however one might explain it, the Cross of Christ, the death of Christ, was a necessary act of self-sacrifice on His part. God became man for the sin of mankind: it was the death of the Son of God, and therefore it revealed that which was above man. It was an Atonement, a necessary atonement for sin, and therefore it was real. It is these two beliefs which have made the Cross of Christ an influence. How we may explain the Atonement we may not be able to say, but when we read the long history of the doctrine of the Atonement, the spirit in which we should do so is not that of pointing out how wrong everyone was, but of seeing how true everyone was. Each age felt that the death of Christ saved them from the form in which evil had come. Athanasius, in the corrupt life of the fourth century when the world seemed very evil, saw how, through the Cross, the Divine image was restored to mankind. The Christian missionary of the Dark Ages, living in a world which seemed peopled by evil spirits, knew that he and those who listened to him had received salvation from the powers of darkness in the Cross of Christ. The mediæval theologian, brooding over the tremendous majesty of the Divine sovereignty, feeling how sin was a tremendous violation of that majesty and sanctity, felt that a great sacrifice had been offered and a great reparation paid. The Reformer, haunted with a continual sense of his own sin, thrown back on the introspection of his individual life, and feeling his awful unworthiness, found in the Cross his salvation. The modern thinker, appalled by the inadequacy of his own consciousness of guilt, sees in the contrition of Christ the true ideal contrition. None of them were wrong; they are all right. It is only wrong when a particular aspect of the Atonement is lifted into being necessary orthodox doctrine, when a scheme of salvation is put before us, when a human interpretation of the Atonement is put in the place of the Atonement.

When we read Maurice's stern protest against the form of theology of his own day we can sympathize with him.

Digitized by Google

There is a great deal in what Mr. Campbell writes which is, we will not say true, but a half-understood representation of what is true. He knows a little about Semitic origins, a little about modern theories of sacrifice, a little about St. Paul's rabbinical learning, but he does not know enough about anything to use his knowledge properly, and he has not the sense of reverence and respect for the great thinkers who have preceded him to enable him to re-interpret the Gospel to the present day. So far as we are aware the world is not suffering from the unreal presentation of an orthodox theory of Atonement; it is suffering much more because it is only laboriously adapting its mind to new and destructive criticism, and we do not think that Mr. Campbell helps it to do so.

VI.

There are many more points in Mr. Campbell's book upon which we might dwell. In all we should find the same element of half-truth, but it is hardly worth while to deal with it in greater detail, and we propose to ask rather, Where is the fundamental error underlying Mr. Campbell's writings? And (since we consider him typical of a very large body of thought) What are the more serious difficulties at the present day? The first point we should put in the guise of a quotation from Dr. Forsyth, in an article on 'The Newest Theology' in the *British Weekly*.

'*Wherein*,' he asks, '*does the theological situation to-day differ from that of thirty or fifty years ago—especially on the progressive side?* And the answer appears to me to carry us to the point I am always pressing but cannot easily get people to face—the point of our central and final authority. It is a question which does not trouble those who live spiritually from hand to mouth, and are satisfied with the beauties, the charities, the graciousness generally, of the religious life. Nor does it weigh on those who are immersed in the philanthropies or politics which engross the hour. But it is the question of the day in those Churches and sections of society where men still have the educated habit of thoroughness, and the persistent resolution to know just where they honestly are. It is the question wherever the pursuit of perfection takes the place of slipshod religionism, and

Digitized by Google

where men are sure that no Church can continue to stand unless it have a definite relation to a positive authority, and a real sympathy with every effort to force attention to that point. No Church, no preacher, knows where he is till he has a sure sense of his relation to such an authority. The Bible as a book has gone in that final sense. What replaces it? Is it in your own reason you find your Master? It is the urgency of this question of authority that makes the great difference between the position to-day and that of half a century ago.' [1]

What is to be our authority? That is the question Dr. Forsyth asks, and on that point Mr. Campbell will agree with him—that the Bible has gone in the sense of a final authority. In that sense we should also agree with him, but we should not think that this was entirely new. The only change is that modern criticism has brought home to the Protestant world the inadequacy of the Bible as a final authority. Having recognized that, let us state at once that it is only for those who accepted in its crudest form the Bible and the Bible only as their authority that the present situation makes any real change. The result of the newest criticism has only been to continue a process which began when Erasmus first attempted to criticize the Bible in a historic sense. The change from the Middle Ages has been a slow and complicated one, hampered not only by fear of unorthodoxy but by the fact that Protestantism stereotyped a particular stage of the process. It has been throughout the work of scholars. The authority of the Vulgate had to be overthrown, and the authority of the scholastic interpretation which treated the Bible like a big law book. Allegory had to yield to history, traditional interpretations to grammar, and it is that change which is only being continued at the present day in what is called the higher criticism. The higher criticism does not overthrow the Bible: it only introduces another and we believe a more rational method of interpreting it. It has made the problems of the Old Testament very much less difficult; it brings out its reality and spiritual religion. It is only to those to whom the Bible has been the one, only, final

[1] *The British Weekly*, March 7, 1907.

Digitized by Google

authority that the difficulty is really serious. But the Church of England has always laid down in one way or another in her many formulæ that the Christian faith is older than the New Testament. And as Mr. Walker remarks:

'This faith, I would next point out, does not rest primarily on any *Scriptures*. The New Testament was the *product* of this faith, not its foundation. There was no such Book in the hands of the earliest Christians. But there was in them a glowing enthusiasm of love for God and for humanity, kindled by simple faith in Christ and His Cross.' [1]

To us the Christian faith is that faith which we know historically to have been taught by the Church from the beginning, and which has been enshrined and formulated in the great Creed which is the ultimate product of centuries of Christian thought and controversy and of four great Councils of the Church. Its authority is twofold. On the one side it represents the teaching of the universal Church; on the other side it may be proved by most certain warrant of Scripture. In the authority of the Church as interpreting Scripture and as controlled by Scripture we can, in the present day, find a quite adequate basis of belief.

No doubt we shall be reminded at once that the ultimate authority is reason; that is Dr. Forsyth's solution of the ultimate authority, as it is Mr. Campbell's. The ultimate authority for each individual quite truly is his own reason and his own conscience; that one can never escape from. You may accept the infallibility of the Pope, but it requires an act of reason to assent to it, conscious or unconscious, and no one can escape from the ultimate individual decision. But Christianity claims to be a revelation, and we ask in what documents or in what form the contents of that revelation are contained. We are ourselves quite satisfied with the answer that we can give—the Bible interpreted by the Church, the doctrine of the Church as corroborated by the Scriptures. That is not a mechanical authority. To seek for mechanical authority

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 18.

Digitized by Google

which will abnegate the functions or the powers of reason is to flee from our individual responsibility. Our authority demands from every thoughtful person the use of the gifts that God has given him; but he is able to use those gifts not wandering without a chart over a trackless ocean, but going through the uncertain voyage of life with a knowledge and a teaching which will be, if he is willing, a sufficient guide. It is an authority which gives a healthy Creed to the simple-minded, which does not bind us with the fetters of the past, nor submit us to a spiritual despotism, but provides for all thoughtful minds the material needed for working out the great problems of life and salvation.

For our second point we would take a characteristic utterance of Mr. Campbell, 'Religion is necessary to mankind but Churches are not.' Our answer would be that because religion is necessary to mankind therefore Churches are—or rather to put it more correctly, the Church is—necessary. Mr. Campbell's book contains a great deal of a certain sort of fashionable carping against the Christian Churches, although he admits incidentally that they do a large amount of good. We are as conscious as anyone that the organized Christian societies of the world are very inadequate representations of their ideal; but, as we look at the condition of the world and at the life of the great mass of our fellow-countrymen, we are firmly convinced that it is not primarily in the Churches that the fault lies. The Christian ideal is imperfectly realized, but it is within the Churches, and not outside them, that it is most adequately represented. No doubt we are in a sense to blame—everyone is—for every sin that our brother commits, but the fashionable language which would suggest that all the good in the world lies among those persons who entirely renounce the authority of the Church and the obligations of religion is to us absolutely untrue. It is cant, and nothing but cant. Much of the reaction against Christianity arises not primarily because the Churches are antiquated, but because men wish to live a selfish and material life, and Christianity is a check and restraint on them. We do

Digitized by Google

not deny the existence of many good and high-minded men outside the Church, but the good men and the good women for the most part are now, as they have been in the past, earnest workers in the Christian Churches. The good work that is done is done directly or indirectly because of the Christian societies realizing more adequately than others the lessons of Christianity. It is not in revolt from the Churches, but in a higher realization of the ideal of the Church, that the remedy must come. Above all it is because the inadequate conception of 'Churches' has taken the place of the Church as a great ideal. We are not speaking now simply in the interests of our own or for any other particular community. We do not wish to use any language that should un-church, as the phrase is, our fellow Christians. We would put clearly forward that it is just in such a spirit of disintegration and of individualism that the theological difficulties at the present time arise. We do not desire to hamper individual thought in any way, but the individual thought should be the reverent thought of one who has behind him the whole traditions of Catholic Christianity, not the precarious speculation of one who starts from some particular sect. It is just here that Mr. Campbell's theology fails, and fails completely. The problems he deals with are problems that we all have to face. The solutions that he gives us often contain an approximation to the truth, but he fails because he starts as an individualist —and shall we say as a Protestant?—and not with the life of corporate Christianity behind him. He fails because his attitude towards the Christianity of the past and the Christianity of the present is not that of the reverent scholar, who knows that if he does his work he will advance beyond his teacher, and who should be ashamed of himself if he cannot, but of the clever critic. The clever critic fails, as he always will fail, because he has no reverence. The solution of the problems that Mr. Campbell raises will always be more adequate and true the more the thinker is Catholic and not merely Protestant, reverent and not only critical, believing in the working of the Spirit of God in the Christian Society rather than assuming that the place

Digitized by Google

where God's Spirit works is everywhere but in the historic Church. The greater the unity of the Christian world, the more nearly it preaches the true ideal of the Christian Church, the sooner it will attain to Christian truth.

SHORT NOTICES.

I.—Biblical Studies.

Silanus the Christian. By E. A. Abbott. (London: A. and C. Black, 1906.) *7s. 6d.*

Renan, in the preface to his *Marcus Aurelius*, expresses his profound conviction that 'the period of origins, the embryogeny of Christianity, if one may so express it, ends approximately at the year 180.' The belief of the great critic has received emphatic corroboration from the labours of ecclesiastical historians. The second century is *the* period about which we desire to know most, and about which, as a matter of fact, we know least. On the one side we have the Apostolic Church, with all the freedom and even indefiniteness of organization, of worship, of doctrine inseparable from the earliest stages of a new religion: on the other the tentative and experimental period is almost passed; necessary restrictions, limitations essential for progress in the right direction, judicious conciliations and advanced controversies, all proclaim the silent revolution that has been in progress. But between these two periods there is a great gap; nor, despite much brilliant work and not a few important discoveries, can we congratulate ourselves on having satisfactorily bridged it.

Four problems at least stand out as particularly important for the student of this second century—the growth of the Christian Ministry, the formulation of the Christian Creed, the emergence of a New Testament Canon (and especially the universal acceptance of the Four Gospels, and narrowing our circle again, the origin and authorship of the Fourth) and lastly the relation of the Church to heathen philosophy. The comparative paucity of materials gives free scope for an imaginative reconstruction of the period by an historian who is ready

Digitized by Google

to base his theories on the actual facts of which evidence is forthcoming, and not to twist such facts as we do possess into reluctant accordance with his preconceived theories.

Unfortunately, Dr. Abbott cannot be dissociated from the latter class. *Silanus the Christian*, as a romance, is full of interest; as a literary work, it contains some striking passages; as a religious story, it is not without really beautiful expositions; as a critical contribution, it is worthy of the serious attention of all students as the authoritative announcement of Dr. Abbott's own views; but as an historical study, it is almost worthless. We do not here refer to the part of the book devoted to the teaching of Epictetus, and its skilful comparison and contrast with both the Jewish religion and the Christian revelation: that is well done; some passages, indeed, are admirable—they will be found in chapters x. to xiv., which contrast the views of Isaiah and Epictetus respectively on death and providence. But we cannot say so much for the chapters on the criticism of the Gospels, and on the Gospel miracles. We should listen with patience and respect to the reasons which have led Dr. Abbott to consider the records of Christianity to be (as he states in his preface) 'inadequate, inaccurate, and contradictory.' Or had Dr. Abbott written a religious romance of the present day, and used one of the characters as a mouthpiece for his own sentiments, no one would, nor even could, have found fault. But the case stands quite differently when the results of purely modern criticism are put into the mouth of a second century convert. The first essential of an historian is the capacity to lose himself in his characters: he must speak as they would have spoken; they should not speak as he would have done. We must enter an emphatic protest against the use of these ancient Romans and Greeks as the mouthpieces of twentieth century criticism. It throws over the latter the mantle of antiquity to which it has not the remotest claim. If we had knowledge that the problems raised by modern writers were largely canvassed before the middle of the second century, the whole outlook would be changed. It is just this very fact, that they are wholly at variance with everything we know as to either the historical or critical standpoint of those days, that makes us refuse to accept them as a true explanation of the various difficulties for which a solution has to be found. To introduce these modern views as natural reflections in the mouths of second century characters is to beg the whole question, and is also most misleading for those who are unable to discriminate between the author and his

Digitized by Google

characters. It is possible that we do Dr. Abbott an injustice; but even the most obtuse of literary critics cannot fail to note the connexion (similarity of thought being, of course, far more subtle, and yet not less easily felt than identity of language) between the criticism of Scaurus and the articles characteristic of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. Is it possible to regard the latter as an apocryphal work, written long since, perused by Scaurus, treasured by the faithful, but only in these latter times produced for the edification of the Church? Yes, Scaurus must have read that famous work. The hypothesis may sound extravagant; but after reading *Silanus* the impartial critic will admit its obvious simplicity compared with not a few of the views put forward in that book. It has, moreover, the further merit of being the only alternative which will rescue the historical worth of Dr. Abbott's story.[1]

We have somewhere seen a theory spoken of as a tissue of complicated improbabilities. We think the phrase might have been reserved with advantage as an appropriate description of not a few of the views advanced in this book to shew the untrustworthiness of the Gospels as historical narratives. Scaurus on the Resurrection is particularly brilliant, particularly wild, and particularly unconvincing. At the present it is customary with most critics to regard St. Luke as a careful and accurate historian. But to Dr. Abbott he is 'only a compiler laboriously tracing back the truth through documents,' mixing up fact and fiction, prose and poetry in the most extraordinary manner, and continually making 'errors much to be regretted' (p. 254).

Space forbids us to go through all the numerous criticisms, emendations, and explanations which abound in such prolific profusion. But we would point out a general reflection wherewith we can console ourselves. Dr. Abbott disparages historical witness as a basis of belief, and he adds that 'true conviction is derived from no source but the convincing spirit of the Saviour coming to us in various ways and through many instruments, but mostly through disciples whom the Saviour loves.' That is very true; but the various ways and many instruments do not exclude the evangelical testimony. For belief in a fact or in a credible witness may be the first step to belief in Him of whom the witness is borne or the fact recorded, even as Christ's first words were an exhortation to 'believe in the Gospel.'

[1] At any rate Clemens is acquainted with Hymns Ancient and Modern, 260! (P. 357.)

Digitized by Google

With regard to the Fourth Gospel, the author says much that is beautiful, much that is true; and he says it with force and directness. His statement with regard to the external testimony as to the supremacy of the three Gospels (288) needs modification, and his statement that Justin *never* quotes the fourth verbally is surely not quite accurate, in the face of the almost certain quotation of our Lord's words with regard to the 'new birth.' Again, the raising of Lazarus is treated as an example of 'metaphor for fact' (337). But the metaphor is so extremely elaborate that it could hardly be the origin of the vivid and simple narrative of fact, while a simple fact might quite well serve as the basis for elaborate metaphor. The water and the blood from the Saviour's side is explained as an apocalyptic vision (329, 357). 'That it is not a fact could be proved if needful.' It is not 'needful to prove' that Dr. Abbott minimizes the part played by John the Apostle, the eye-witness, in the composition of the Gospel—and 'the book is a poem, not a history.'

Dr. Abbott has a great name, a great reputation; and deservedly so. This book is assured of a wide and appreciative circle. Sympathetic reviewers have predicted for it a career of immense influence. We have therefore thought it our duty to point out its weaknesses. The book as a whole is marked by much penetrating criticism, valuable as Dr. Abbott's personal contribution to the controversy surrounding an exceptionally difficult problem; as a literary romance, it is full of charm; but while we hope that we shall always be duly grateful to any distinguished scholar for giving us the benefit of his researches, and, most of all, when they are presented in a popular and readable form, yet we cannot approve of a method which seems to give modern theories the credit of antiquity, to which they have absolutely no claim.

The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology. By E. F. Scott, M.A. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906.) 6s. net.

This book is an attempt to draw out the teaching of the Fourth Gospel on the assumption that it is a controversial work of the second century, written by one who had never known Jesus after the flesh. The Gospel, it is urged, is an attempt to combine a presentation of the Christian religious experience with a justification of that experience in terms of current philosophy. The writer has presented this in the form of a

Digitized by Google

Gospel because he has grasped the supreme value of the historic revelation in Jesus.

To begin with, the value of this attempt is seriously lessened by the inability of Mr. Scott to discriminate between what is fanciful and what is reasonable. For instance, he is inclined to see in the incident of Nathanael a symbolical allusion to St. Paul, the Israelite indeed, and a claim for his rightful place among the very chiefest of the Apostles. This will serve to shew how completely the historical side of the Gospel is given up. The whole has been created out of the Synoptic Gospels as interpreted in Christian life and experience. The vivid touches of detail are due to the fine instinct of a literary artist, or introduced as veiled allegorical allusions for their symbolic value. Thus the story of Lazarus is woven out of the raising of Jairus' daughter and the widow's son, the Lucan account of Martha and Mary, and the parable of Dives and Lazarus with its significant closing words 'Neither will they believe though one be raised from the dead.' The Virgin Mother is the ancient faith, which is absorbed in the Church and so dwells in the house of the disciple. The Resurrection and Ascension are simultaneous, though a concession is made to tradition in the shape of the story of the appearance to Mary; 'but his own interpretation allowed no room for an Ascension such as is described by the writer of Acts' (p. 308).

Mr. Scott finds in the Gospel a development, along peculiar lines, of Paulinism. The doctrine of the Spirit has really no place in the religious position of John, because the Parousia is present and not future; and so the Spirit simply represents the present influence of Christ. But is it possible to account satisfactorily for the place which the doctrine occupies in the life of the early Church and the teaching of St. Paul apart from the teaching on the subject preserved in this Gospel? Jesus, we are told, alludes to the Spirit in only a few isolated sayings of minor importance; and the language which suggests the personality of the Spirit must not be pressed, for 'the Spirit is an influence imparted through Christ to those who believe in Him' (p. 343). The attitude to the Logos doctrine is of a piece with the rest. In it John presents a semi-physical magical view of life, which obscures the more majestic and important background of the historic life. This metaphysical theory has led to what is regarded as a false view of the sacraments as Sacraments, and to the substitution of a barren dogma for a living faith.

Digitized by Google

The Fourth Gospel and some recent German Criticism. By H. L. JACKSON, B.D. (Cambridge University Press, 1906.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

THIS volume embodies a course of lectures given on Sunday afternoons to parishioners. They are entirely critical and reasons are wisely included why, for the time being, much which the Christian reader naturally values most must be put on one side.

The method adopted is to put forward the views of two representative German critics—Barth and Wernle—with references to many others, and then to make an independent examination of each question and to summarize the evidence. We think Mr. Jackson would have been better advised, had he somewhat narrowed down the quotations and the points discussed. The issues would have gained in clearness, and the needs of the general reader been sufficiently met. Even as it is, the book will, we believe, prove distinctly useful.

The conclusion is naturally not decisive, but it is thought that John the Apostle and the beloved disciple are distinct persons, and that the Gospel is the work of the latter. We are disappointed with the section on Miracle. We are told that there are two conceptions of miracle—a very distortion of the wonderful, the downright prodigy, and that which though strange is not contrary to reason, but admits of explanation, a marvel in perfect harmony with Law. The outcome is that Mr. Jackson finds the explanation of the miracles of Cana of Galilee, and of feeding the five thousand in figurative utterances which have come to be understood literally. The Christian accepts miracle because he believes in the direct action of God, and that, to quote Bishop Gore, 'He breaks into the common order of events, in order to manifest the real meaning of nature.'[1] It is better to leave the matter as it stands in the Gospel than to throw overboard a miracle so widely attested as the feeding of the multitude.

The Gospel of the Rejection. A Study in the Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Three. By the REV. W. RICHMOND, Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. (London: Murray, 1906.) 5*s.* net.

MR. RICHMOND takes the three points of the scene of the events, the substance of the teaching, and the disciples' apprehension of

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 45.

Digitized by Google

our Lord's claim, as contrasted in the four Gospels, and maintains, in opposition to Dr. Drummond's general conclusions, that the story of the three presupposes the facts which St. John supplies, and is only explicable if Jerusalem had already developed an antagonism to Christ. This antagonism, he urges, was provoked by the revelation of truth which Jerusalem ought to have been ready to accept, though the Galilean disciples needed to be prepared and led on to its apprehension. Mr. Richmond, it will be observed, is not considering questions of authenticity, authorship, or authority. His point is the historical gain of St. John's Gospel, taken as it stands. He treats the subject somewhat in the style of Dr. Young's *The Christ of History*, and his matter will prove interesting not only to the student and the harmonist, but to the general reader. After discussing the main thesis under the heads which we have indicated, Mr. Richmond adds some supplementary illustrations of some of the less obvious differences between St. John and the other Evangelists: namely, omissions in one of the incidents told in the others, the different place of miracles in the two narratives, and the different picture of our Lord's Person and character. The book is a modest but valuable contribution to the study of the Gospels.

A Grammar of New Testament Greek. By J. H. MOULTON, D. Lit. Vol. I. Prolegomena. First edition ('based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar'). Second edition, with corrections and additions. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1906.) 8s. net.

THE fact that a second edition of this book was called for within six months of its first appearance is the highest testimonial to its importance and a welcome sign of the widespread interest in the exact study of the New Testament. The second edition differs from the first in the addition of some seven pages of notes, a slight recasting of the Preface, and in a significant change (made with some reluctance) in the title, from which the reference to 'Moulton's Winer' now disappears.

The previous history of Winer-Moulton is no doubt familiar to all students of the New Testament. Winer's epoch-making *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* saw the light over fifty years ago. In 1870 it appeared first in an English dress, edited by Dr. W. F. Moulton, whose work has long been recognized as the manual in the subject for English readers. A new

Digitized by Google

edition, however, has of recent years been a desideratum; Dr. W. F. Moulton's educational work debarred him from any revision on a large scale in the later English editions of 1877 and 1882, and it has been left to the able hands of his son, on whom has descended (though he would be the first to disclaim it) a double portion of his father's spirit, to make full use of the large material which has been accumulating during the last half-century.

The present instalment, at any rate, is an entirely new and independent work. In it are laid down the general principles which must govern the study of the New Testament language in future; and the student is taken through the various departments of the Accidence and Syntax and shewn the salient characteristics of the New Testament language in the light of the new evidence. A detailed discussion is reserved for later volumes.

The 'new evidence,' which has effected a revolution in our ideas, is that afforded by the papyri, unearthed in Egypt mainly within the last decade, new volumes of which continue to appear with bewildering rapidity. Here we have a mass of documents, most of them accurately dated, others capable of being dated approximately, ranging over a thousand years from 300 B.C. to the eighth century A.D., including letters, wills, contracts, petitions, &c., written by persons of every grade in the social scale. We thus possess for this millennium the fullest knowledge of vernacular Greek as spoken in Egypt. Yet the evidence is not entirely new. The Paris Papyri were edited over forty years ago, and the Turin collection has been accessible for twice that length of time; but, somehow, the earlier collections remained unnoticed until the recent discoveries brought them into prominence. It is Dr. Moulton's privilege to have been the first to bring these documents to bear upon the grammar of the New Testament, following the lead of Dr. Deissmann in Germany, who has done similar pioneer work in connexion with the vocabulary of the Greek Bible. And what is the result? Dr. Moulton finds that the language of the New Testament writers is simply that of the Κοινή, the language of the common people spoken wherever the Greek language was spoken since the time of Alexander. New Testament Greek is simply a department of the Κοινή: 'Biblical Greek' becomes almost an obsolete term: the old controversy between the Purists (who endeavoured to bring every novelty under Attic rules) and the Hebraists (who exaggerated the Semitic influence)

Digitized by Google

must give place to the recognition that New Testament Greek is not an isolated phenomenon, lying in a back-water, but stands out in the main stream of the development of the Greek language. Some readers may regard with natural regret this deposition, as it may appear, of the New Testament language from the unique position which it has sometimes been supposed to hold. There can, however, no longer be a doubt as to the correctness of the general conclusions arrived at, and that in future the papyri must be taken as the starting point and clue to the correct understanding of the New Testament. There is in reality little cause for regret in the fact that the earliest records which we possess of the sayings of Christ and the writings of His followers were written in the language 'understanded of the people.' Dr. Moulton admits (p. 20) that the language of the several New Testament writers must be studied in connexion with that of the sacred volume as a whole, and a few instances are given where Christianity may have definitely affected the grammar (p. 68, πιστεύειν εἰς, cf. p. 192 on οὐ μή). It is possible that the number of these instances will be increased when the detailed portion of the Grammar appears.

The main result of the papyri studies of Dr. Moulton and Dr. Deissmann has been, if not quite to eliminate, yet very largely to reduce the number of so-called 'Hebraisms' in the New Testament. Again and again phrases hitherto regarded as such find illustration in documents where Jewish influence is out of the question or highly improbable. Dr. Moulton makes some acute observations on this subject: attention may specially be called to his remark that Semitic influence is chiefly seen in the 'overworking' of a good Greek word owing to the fact that it corresponds to a word which in Hebrew is in constant use. To this tendency is traced the frequency of ἰδού in some New Testament writers—a phenomenon which is happily illustrated by the 'look you' which is always on the lips of Shakespeare's Captain Fluellen. Yet even this frequency of ἰδού appears not to be wholly due to Semitism: how, for instance, are we to explain as of Semitic origin the normal rendering in the LXX of הלא, *Nonne*, by οὐκ (οὐχ) ἰδού? We must be prepared to find curious coincidences in the vernacular of languages of different families where borrowing is out of the question. The writer points out (p. 94) that Modern Greek agrees with Hebrew in expressing the relative after the manner of Mrs. Gamp, 'which her name is Mrs. Harris': similarly the comparative in Modern Greek may be expressed

Digitized by Google

by the positive with ἀπό, which corresponds exactly to Hebrew usage. Still a doubt arises whether this elimination of Hebraisms is not in danger of being carried too far; the possibility of the populous Jewish settlements in Alexandria and in other large centres of Hellenism having influenced the Κοινή should not be left quite out of sight, though, as the author justly says (p. 94), 'the presence of a usage in Modern Greek affords an almost decisive disproof of Semitism in the Κοινή, only one small corner of whose domain came within range of Semitic influences.' The student of Hellenistic Greek has constantly to look on to the ultimate resultant in the spoken Greek of to-day.

Special mention may be made of the very able treatment of the Tenses. Here, if not quite for the first time (for Burton's *Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* had introduced English readers to the subject), yet in the most masterly manner and with admirable lucidity the views of recent German philologists on the primary function of the tenses as indicating 'modes of action' are brought to bear upon the exegesis of the New Testament.

The style of the work is lively and humorous, and even, we are bound to confess, perhaps occasionally too much so. There is a wealth of happily-chosen 'modern instances,' and the writer has certainly achieved in this introductory volume his ambition of writing a Grammar which can be read.

His pioneer work on the papyri, of which the detailed results are recorded in the pages of the *Classical Review*, might be supplemented by some minutiae. For instance, it appears from the investigations of one who has done some gleaning in the same field that οὐθείς is another form which, like ὃς ἐάν (p. 43), can be traced from the cradle to the grave. First found in an inscription of 378 B.C., it is practically universal in the papyri from 301 to 132 B.C., when it begins to give way to οὐδείς and finally disappears about 200 A.D. Even in the matter of 'the notorious equivalence of ει and ι' (p. 47) the papyri yield some definite results: γίνεσθαι (the Hellenistic equivalent for γίγν.) does not appear to have been written as γείνεσθαι till towards the end of the second century B.C. (the earliest certain examples we have noted by the present writer are in Turin Pap. 5 and 6 circ. 125 B.C. and Tebtunis Pap. 66 of 121–0 B.C.): γεινώσκειν appears to have originated at about the same time. The last thirty years of that century seem to have been a period of transition in matters of orthography.

Illustrations from the LXX might also be supplemented.

Digitized by Google

The use of the nominative for the name-case unaltered by the construction of the sentence (p. 69) is frequent in LXX (*e.g.* Gen. iii. 20, ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναικὸς Ζωή, Num. xxi. 14, ἐν βιβλίῳ Πόλεμος τοῦ κυρίου): the use of the historic present (p. 121) is not so 'rare in the LXX' as Sir John Hawkins, judging by the absence of λέγει, represents it to be (145 exx. occur in 1 Kingdoms alone): ἐὰν ἦν (p. 168) is also fairly common in LXX, ἦν in some cases apparently standing for ᾖ to avoid hiatus, though this will not apply, *e.g.*, to Job xxii. 3, ἐὰν σὺ ἦσθα: the use of the subjunctive in comparisons (p. 185) might be illustrated from Is. vii. 2, xvii. 11, xxxi. 4: on p. 205 it may be added that the inf. of purpose is common in the LXX, with the distinction that with verbs of motion (coming and sending, &c.) it is usually simple, not articular. But of course in these Prolegomena abundance of illustration from this quarter is not to be expected.

Very few misprints have been noted in the second edition: they occur on p. 110 (last line of text), 111 note 1 (accent), 198 note 1 (should not ἀλλὰ be ἄλλα?), 246 note on p. 103 (? read 'stands' for 'supplies'). It may be added that in the reference to the second English edition of Blass' *New Testament Grammar* on p. xvii the words 'occasional reference is made to the second German edition' are hardly a fair description: the two German editions were carefully collated and practically all alterations or additions incorporated.

The book, in short, at once takes or has taken its place as the standard authority on the subject, and the subsequent instalments will be eagerly expected; it is to be hoped that they will not meet with the fate which seems to have befallen the new edition of Winer in its native land.

II. Doctrinal and Practical Theology.

Sin. 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology.' By H. V. S. Eck, M.A., Rector of Bethnal Green. (London: Longmans, 1907.) 5*s.*

Mr. Eck has here given us a book of real, though of unequal, value. Few things are more needed to-day than a full and clear restatement of the Christian doctrine of Sin, in view of modern knowledge, and Mr. Eck has certainly done something to supply this need. He writes, as he modestly explains, not so much from the standpoint of the thinker and theologian, as from that of the parish priest, himself deeply engaged in the conflict with

Digitized by Google

Sin, and interested above all in that which makes for victory over it. Thus, though on the intellectual side he does not greatly help us, it will be our own fault if we do not on the practical side find much that he says of the highest value.

Perhaps it may be well to point out at once where the book appears to us to fail. Mr. Eck scarcely seems to recognize how real are the difficulties which the Christian doctrine presents. Firstly, there are the difficulties involved in the assertion of the freedom of the will; secondly, there is the difficulty of reconciling the existence of moral evil with the power and goodness of God; and, thirdly, there is the difficulty of maintaining the Christian doctrine of original sin, in view of our present scientific knowledge. Mr. Eck does deal to some extent with the problem of freedom, but the other difficulties are never really faced. However insoluble a problem the origin of evil may present, it would surely be worth while in a book such as this, to point out how necessary, even to our limited vision, the permission of moral evil must be, and the glorious purposes which it may be seen to serve. A world without the possibility of moral evil would be a world without the possibility of moral conflict and victory, and so a world lower in the scale of being than the world we know. Mr. Eck's dealing with the question of original sin is again most unsatisfactory. Direct reference to Dr. Tennant's book is confined to one footnote, while the powerful arguments advanced in *The Origin and Propagation of Sin* meet with no attempt to answer them. Indeed, the whole position of those who agree with Dr. Tennant seems to be radically misunderstood. Mr. Eck writes, on p. 28: 'If what we mean by original sin is merely the survival of certain brute instincts, then what we mean by actual sin is robbed entirely of its sinful character; if we may so put it, sin ceases to be sinful.'

But this is not so at all. On Dr. Tennant's view, the brute instincts that have survived are part of the material with which our free will is called to deal, and the refusal to control them is truly and properly sin. No satisfactory answer to Dr. Tennant is possible without a more careful examination of the source of our moral weakness than Mr. Eck has given. The mystery which confronts us is, not that we possess animal tendencies which require careful control, but that apart from divine grace we seem unable entirely to control them. Why have we not this power? Should we not have expected that, when moral consciousness appeared in man, God would have given him such a union with Himself as would enable the moral will

Digitized by Google

to control these lower impulses? Catholic theology differs from Dr. Tennant, not so much in the view it takes as to their source as in its conviction that God did what we might have expected Him to do. He gave us a supernatural union with Himself, and by the Fall we have lost it.

When we pass from intellectual questions to the practical side of the problem of Sin, Mr. Eck is far more helpful. He brings out clearly what the essential character of Sin is. It is, he says on pp. 83, 84: 'The rebellion of a person against a Person, the rebellion of the will of the creature against the Will of that Divine Person who with perfect Knowledge and unerring Wisdom and ineffable Love made him what he is, and gave him a law which, if he obeyed it, would lead him onwards to the uttermost perfection of his being.'

That surely is just what needs to be brought out. The will of God, so to say, is not a mere aesthetic preference for one course of action rather than another; it is the will of One who 'worketh even until now,' and will ever work, for the accomplishment of His purpose of holiness and love, and who demands of us only what is necessary for our co-operation with Him. Clashing will ever bring alienation, and the greater and nobler the purpose that is set aside, the greater the alienation. On all this, Mr. Eck is excellent, as he also is on the real, as contrasted with the false, distinction between mortal and venial sin. Very useful, also, will be his reproduction of Dr. Moberly's teaching on Punishment, Forgiveness and Penitence. It may be hoped that many who have found that teaching difficult to grasp, as Dr. Moberly himself has expressed it, will gain from Mr. Eck's book all that is most important in it, and thus be enabled to hand it on to others.

The Substance of Faith allied with Science. A Catechism for Parents and Teachers. By Sir OLIVER LODGE, F.R.S., Principal of the University of Birmingham. (London: Methuen and Co., 1906). 2*s.* net.

THIS book is sure of a cordial welcome from a wide circle of readers, and without pretending to agree with it in every detail we think that thoughtful parents and teachers, and above all the clergy, should read it with sympathetic interest. Its author has a considerable reputation as a man of science, and is an intelligent and sympathetic student of theology, but from the theological point of view the book is less satisfactory than the similar work of teachers who are theologians, and also not un-

Digitized by Google

acquainted with science. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, for any theologian to keep abreast of the rapid growth of scientific knowledge as a whole, when specialists in many departments of science advance so rapidly that they can scarcely expect to be fully understood by other scientific workers in an adjacent field; but there are happily theologians who have learned not only to tolerate, but to welcome and use, new discoveries in natural science for the illustration and enrichment of their own science of God. We believe that if any man is to write a catechism of the sort which will win its way to anything like universal acceptance, he must be a man who is primarily a theologian, but one who, because he is a theologian in the true sense of the word, will eagerly watch the gradual unfolding of the Divine mind and will increasingly manifested in the processes of nature.

The catechism contains twenty questions and answers, many of which are admirably adapted for their purpose, and the Introduction and Commentary greatly enhance the value of the whole. It should be noted that Sir Oliver Lodge has not attempted to produce a complete system of religion; and he is too sane to think that there is a simple and sufficient body of doctrine which should be taught by all sensible men to the *exclusion* of formularies distinctive of separate denominations. By the 'substance' of faith he understands not essence but substratum.

'A foundation is not to be mistaken for superstructure; a full-fledged and developed religion needs a great deal more than foundation; there must be building, too. The warmth and vitality imparted by strong religious conviction is a matter of common observation, and is a force of great magnitude; but it is a personal and living thing, it cannot be embodied in a formula or taught in a class. Here lies the proper field of work of the Churches. What can be taught in a school is the fundamental substratum underlying all such developments and personal aspirations; and it can be dealt with on a basis of historical and scientific fact, interpreted and enlarged by the perceptions and experiences of mankind.'

The desire to keep the substratum as broad as possible accounts for the fact that Sir Oliver Lodge neither affirms nor denies the Godhead of our Saviour or His resurrection from the dead. Now we gladly recognize how much that is true and useful about God and man may be taught to children apart from the truths which lie at the very heart of our Creed, but we should regard it as most injurious if this catechism were taught as a substitute for the Apostles' Creed, or the familiar catechism

Digitized by Google

of the Church, to the children of parents who accept those ancient documents and have no wish to substitute a new theology for the old.

On the other hand, we should esteem it a great gain if school-masters, especially in our public schools, would learn from this book to teach science in a way that leaves room for religion, and to teach religion in a way which does not ignore science. The cause of charity and the cause of truth would be well served if men would lay to heart the words of St. Augustine :

'It is a very dangerous and pernicious thing and one greatly to be watched against, that any individual should hear a Christian talking wild nonsense about the earth and the heaven, about the motions and magnitude and intervals of the stars, the courses of years and times, the nature of animals, stones and other matters of the same kind, pretending that he has the authority of the Scriptures on his side. The other who understands these things from reason or experience, seeing that the Christian is utterly ignorant of the subject, that he is wide of the mark by a whole heaven, cannot refrain from laughter.' (*De Gen. ad Lit.* i. 39.)

We cannot attempt any detailed criticism in a short notice and must content ourselves with quoting two or three of the definitions which strike us as containing elements both true and suggestive.

'*Q.* 1. Who are you?

A. I am a being alive and conscious upon this earth ; a descendant of ancestors who rose by gradual processes from lower forms of animal life, and with struggle and suffering became man.'

This answer is not intended to be complete in itself and cannot be fairly criticized without reference to Q. 12 :

'*Q.* What is to be said of man's higher faculties?

A. The faculties and achievements of the highest among mankind—in Art, in Science, in Philosophy and Religion—are not explicable as an outcome of a struggle for existence. Something more than mere life is possessed by us, something represented by the words "mind" and "soul" and "spirit." On one side we are members of the animal kingdom ; on another we are associates in a loftier type of existence, and are linked with the Divine.'

Sir Oliver Lodge has elsewhere said, 'The higher man of to-day is not worrying about his sins at all.' [1] In this connexion, therefore, we have pleasure in quoting his definition of Sin which involves a true doctrine of guilt and responsibility, though we miss the definite expression that Sin is disobedience to Almighty

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, April 1904.

Digitized by Google

God, and in the case of Christians the breach of a covenant with Him. So far as it goes it is true and striking that

'Sin is the deliberate and wilful act of a free agent who sees the better and chooses the worse, and thereby acts injuriously to himself and others. The root sin is selfishness, whereby needless trouble and pain are inflicted on others; when fully developed it involves moral suicide.'

A Longer Catechism. For Members of the English Church. By Rev. H. E. HALL, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Staines. With Introduction by Rev. F. W. PULLER, M.A., S.S.J.E. (London: Knott.)

IT is characteristic of the Church of England to be easily satisfied with a small list of formally authoritative documents. The need which has been satisfied in Scotland by the *Larger Catechism* exists in England of course as everywhere else. But, though there is talk from time to time of supplying it, we are still without any formal document of advanced instruction. The present work, first published in 1902, is an attempt by private enterprise to meet the requirement, and the great authority of Father Puller, whom the author invited to introduce his work to the public, is sufficient to ensure for it very careful consideration. The most cursory glance shews that it has one great merit; it is based on the Church Catechism in the Prayer Book, and its teaching may therefore be expected to be strictly an advance on that. It endeavours to deal more fully with matters which the Church Catechism necessarily leaves aside, and this is exactly what is wanted for advanced teaching. Moreover, the author tells us in his prefatory note that it has been tested in practice, and that in forming his definitions he has gone to recognized authorities, such as Hooker and Jeremy Taylor.

To a very large extent we think that the promise of this book is fulfilled. The teaching is clear, and keeps closely to the language of Holy Scripture. This excellence is particularly marked in the section explaining the Creed, where of course it is of very great importance. If we venture, therefore, to offer some criticisms on a few points that have arrested our attention, it will not be inferred, we hope, that criticism represents our general attitude towards the book. To put forms of expression first, we think that the question 'What is God?' (p. 12) is not well expressed. The answer ('God is Spirit') shews that the question really means, 'What do we know of the Nature of God?' Again, on page 14, the question *Why* is Jesus Christ truly God?' seems to us objectionable. The words 'Why' and 'Because' are surely the wrong ones. What is

Digitized by Google

wanted here also is a statement of the meaning of a particular theological phrase. We regret that the distinction of mortal and venial sins has been imported (p. 28). The distinction is really disciplinary or legal rather than moral, and it seems doubtful whether it serves any valuable purpose. The practical difficulty of it is shewn on the same page; venial sins are said to 'lead on very easily to mortal sin.' It would have been truer to say that acts which may be venial sins in one set of circumstances may easily become mortal, and then it would have been clear that the distinction is not strictly an ethical distinction at all. We regret that in the answer defining Charity (p. 23) there is no allusion to love to man. This, we suppose, is partly due to the disastrous use of the word 'charity' in 1 Cor. xiii. (A.V.), and partly to the exigencies of classification. Theological virtues having been defined as virtues by which 'we are enabled to unite ourselves to God,' the scope of charity is necessarily limited. But the definition is inadequate to St. Paul's account of the virtue. It is perhaps a small point, but we think it would tend to produce confusion in the mind of a pupil to find twelve fruits of the Holy Ghost in his catechism and only nine in his Bible. This is another case in which the desire for classification has done some violence to scriptural language. In the account of the Atonement something more should be said as to the Propitiation of Christ? It is certainly a very difficult idea, and has been gravely distorted; but it is certainly in Scripture, and is, we think, necessary to fill out the idea of Sacrifice.

Confession and Absolution. By ALFRED G. MORTIMER, D.D. (London: Longmans, 1906.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

THIS little book is doctrinal and hortatory. The hortatory part is simple and persuasive. The doctrinal part is also good on the whole, but it shews no freshness of thought and endorses views which we cannot accept; for instance, the quantitative estimate of the temporal punishment of sin, and the denial of voluntary freedom after death (p. 78). The writer takes the judicial rather than the remedial view of absolution, though that view militates against the assurance which the sacrament is intended to give; for who can be sure that the sentence may not have been invalidated by his own deficient contrition or by the priest's laxity? Dr. Mortimer asserts that 'it is of the essence of a sacrament that it should be administered to an individual,' and that if the Absolution in the Communion Service was intended to remit deadly sins, it was the invention of a new sacrament (pp. 108–10). We should say that it was, at most, the introduction of a new method of administering the old

Digitized by Google

sacrament, and may be compared to the change from the primitive public and episcopal Absolution to the permitted bestowal of the same gift privately by the priest.

We are sorry that a useful book should be marred by faults which a friendly critic is bound to censure.

The Eternal Saviour-Judge. By JAMES LANGTON CLARKE, M.A., late Fellow of the University of Durham. (London: Murray, 1904.) 9s. net; new and cheaper edition, 1905, 4s. net.

THE object of this book is to offer a solution of eschatological difficulties. Passing by the doctrine of endless retribution and the theories of conditional immortality and universalism, Mr. Clarke suggests that those who will not attain to the reward promised to the faithful may yet be reconciled to God so as to reach, not the full blessing of the covenanted eternal life but a less privilege and service. He bases this view on his interpretation that the saving work and judgeship of Christ have the same abiding character as His priesthood. Without asserting that reconciliation will certainly be the lot of all who fail to gain the fulness of eternal life, he refuses to allow that the condemned are doomed to endless pain and misery and alienation from God, or that there cannot be less and subordinate blessings besides the supreme joy of the promised bliss. The treatment of the subject is thoughtful and temperate; and a useful discussion might be raised whether the view advocated differs in any essential principle from forms of the notion of the amelioration of the condition of the lost which some exponents of the traditional theology have not altogether rejected.

As a positive solution it does not seem to us to allow for the scantiness and uncertainty of its supposed Scriptural basis; for the sense in Scripture and throughout Christian theology of the terrible condition of those who are not among the saved, and of the final issues involved in the use of the probation of this life; and for the force of the considerations which point to the possibility of men becoming morally incapable of repentance and good.

Communion with God. By W. HERRMANN. 'Crown Theological Library.' (Williams and Norgate, 1906.) 5s.

THE Ritschlian theology, of which this book is a popular presentation, is an attempt to preserve some of the traditional characteristics of Lutheran Protestantism, and especially its polemic against the Roman Catholic Church, without rejecting

Digitized by Google

the results of modern Biblical scholarship. It discards certain parts of Luther's teaching, such as his Eucharistic doctrine, as a mere residuum of his former creed, and is almost violently hostile to the whole Greek and Catholic sacramental idea, which it calls mysticism. It still preaches justification by faith, which however it carefully distinguishes from belief. It appeals to 'the historical Christ,' and insists vehemently upon 'history' as the basis of Christian faith, though it declares in the same breath that a critical investigation of the sacred records 'does not give us facts on which our real faith could be based' (p. 69). 'The decision which we reach that these things are facts proceeds from our own independent activity' (p. 71). 'The question whether the portrait of Jesus belongs to fact or fiction . . . . cannot be answered by the science whose business it is to find out what can be proved to be real.' The answer must be based on 'personal conviction,' which will inevitably follow an earnest study of the sources (pp. 73, 113). The features in the Gospel narrative which convey this overpowering impression are 'only two'—'the conflict with pious Judaism,' and Christ's 'remarkable assurance against the opposition of the world' (p. 87). The consciousness of the Christian that God communes with him rests partly on 'the historical fact of the Person of Jesus' (which we arrive at in the manner described above), and partly on the fact that 'we hear within ourselves the demand of the moral law' (p. 103).

In this last clause we reach solid ground. The foundation of the structure is an austere and independent moralism. Conscience, the categorical imperative, is the one religious fact which we know by actual experience. Our 'personal conviction' as to certain historical events, which, we are told, cannot be established by historical methods, can be produced by an effort of the will, concentrated upon the study of the Synoptic narrative. Their validity, rather than their truth, is proved by the state of our feelings which follows the effort. The effort, however, is neither supported nor rewarded by any spiritual communion with the glorified Christ, for the possibility of any such communion is strenuously denied (cf. *e.g.* pp. 282, 291). 'We do not find such communion spoken of in the New Testament[!]' 'The risen Christ is hidden from us.'

To a Churchman, this worship of a dead Christ galvanized into a semblance of life by the moral energy of the believer must seem inexpressibly cold and hollow. And yet this book, like others proceeding from the same school, contains edifying

Digitized by Google

pages which shew real loyalty to our great Example, and sincere admiration for His character and teaching. So rich is our inheritance in the Gospel of Christ that the soul can live and thrive, in a fashion, on even the poorest fragment of the truth. But when, as on p. 291, the author tries to persuade us that in a sense 'the Lord is still with us,' we must remind him that his theory completely cuts us off from this source of consolation, as well as from the hope that the Incarnation is in any real sense continued in the life of the Christian Church.

III.—Philosophy of Religion.

Christian and Stoic in the Second Century. By L. Alston. (Longmans, 1906.) 3s. net.

We welcome this little book as an interesting and readable exposition of the characteristic differences between these two religious systems. The author disclaims originality; but if he is not original, he yet has a vivid and forcible way of illustrating his points. At times, indeed, his affectation of the epigrammatic style is apt to lead him to put forward somewhat paradoxical propositions, which certainly call for some modification.

We are not quite sure that Mr. Alston's method is the best for approaching the subject. A certain amount of historical introduction is really essential as a *point d'appui*. It is not sufficient merely to state the doctrines and differences of two religions; it is necessary to inquire into their origin and development if we would obtain a clear insight into their radical divergences.

The whole difference between Christianity and Stoicism is ultimately traceable to the conception of God. This the Christian took over from the Jewish idea of a Living God, capable of entering into personal relation with man; and it was this relation between man and God which determined man's attitude to his fellowmen. It is obvious how totally different the conception is from Stoic Pantheism; and it is to this fundamental divergence that all further differences are ultimately traceable. Mr. Alston has, however, left the treatment of this subject to the end of his book, when it should in reality have stood at the very beginning, and all subsequent comparisons between the two systems should have been based on the conclusions thus reached.

The title is slightly misleading. 'The Christian in the Second

Digitized by Google

Century' is represented by a numerous body—apologists, preachers, visionaries—the Stoic by one single author who, as is well pointed out, 'scratched down rather than wrote out his thoughts.' There were of course modifications of Stoicism no less remarkable than the varieties of Christianity.

We cannot follow the author in all his criticisms either of the imperial philosopher or of the early Christians, to whom at times he barely does sufficient justice (*e.g.* on such questions as 'purity' and 'simplicity'), but nevertheless the book will give genuine pleasure to anyone who, reading it, will welcome a further illustration of the strange paradox of Christianity and Stoicism, that the latter professing to be strong was discovered weak, and the former in dying for others found its own fullest life.

From Epicurus to Christ. A Study in the Principles of Personality. By WILLIAM DE WITT HYDE, President of Bowdoin College. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

SIDE by side with Mr. Alston's book we may set a larger work published in America two or three years ago. Dr. Hyde describes the moral types fostered by the philosophies of Epicurus, the Stoa, Plato, and Aristotle respectively, shewing their merits and defects; and then he explains the spirit of the Christian religion, which unites the strength of all four, while avoiding the weaknesses of each. He has forsaken the chronological order, probably because he considers the system of Epicurus to contain the smallest amount of truth, and that of Aristotle the largest, of the pre-Christian philosophies. It would perhaps have been better to follow the actual course of development; but the defect is a small one. The author has illustrated the tenets of the ancient schools by modern instances. Tito Melema is a good example of Epicureanism of the baser sort, while John Stuart Mill figures as an 'Epicurean heretic.' The defiant endurance of Stoicism is illustrated by the fine lines of Henley, beginning, 'Out of the night that covers me,' and, less happily, by Matthew Arnold. The tendency to unreality in the Stoic's haughty acceptance of adversity is exposed by W. S. Gilbert's comic lines, 'To the Terrestrial Globe.' Emerson is selected as the modern Platonist; Cecil Rhodes and Abraham Lincoln are quoted as the authors of Aristotelian sentiments.

Christianity includes everything of value in Epicureanism—it has its gladness without its exclusiveness; its naturalness without its baseness; its geniality without its heartlessness.

Digitized by Google

The Christian has the Stoic strength without its hardness; its exaltation without its pride; its integrity without its formalism; its calm without its apathy. Christianity teaches us, as clearly as Plato, how to subordinate the lower in our nature to the higher; but its 'higher' is attainable by the serf as well as by the philosopher. Like Aristotle, Christianity upholds the principle of the devotion of life to a worthy end, and the selection of efficient means for its accomplishment; but the end at which the Christian aims is much higher, and the courage which it demands is much deeper than the duties of a citizen in an aristocratic state.

The chief lesson which these old philosophies may teach us is that we must try to combine the strong points of each. The omission of the Epicurean or the Stoical or the Platonic or the Aristotelian element mutilates and impoverishes the Christian view of life. Asceticism is Christianity minus the truth taught by Epicurus. Sentimental liberalism lacks the Stoic note. Dogmatic orthodoxy is in need of Plato's searchlight of sincerity. Sacerdotal ecclesiasticism is Christianity that has lost the Aristotelian disinterestedness.

Dr. Hyde's view of Christianity is sensible and enlightened, and he has written a book which is pleasant to read, and full of good thoughts.

Philosophical Studies. By DAVID G. RITCHIE, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at St. Andrews. With a Memoir by PROFESSOR R. LATTA. (London: Macmillan.) 10s. net.

PROFESSOR RITCHIE was a thinker with a marked individuality. The philosopher and the citizen were closely blended in him; and his interest in practical questions gave a freshness and keenness to his intellectual studies. He was a disciple of Hegel, but too original to follow any master slavishly. The chief objects of his polemic were Herbert Spencer on the one hand, and such extreme exponents of Pragmatism as William James and F. C. S. Schiller on the other. The present volume contains several good specimens of his humorous criticism, as when he finds a motto for philosophical pluralism in Stevenson's lines about the world being 'so full of a number of things,' or when he tells the story of the tipsy man, who, hearing St. Paul's clock strike twelve, cried out, 'Can't you let us have all that at once?' —a true mystic, says Ritchie, wishing to transcend the category of time! Students of philosophy will find his critique of Professor Ward's *Naturalism and Agnosticism* very suggestive;

Digitized by Google

and his vigorous attack upon the 'radical empiricism' of Professor James and his followers is as well timed as it is effective. The pluralism of the American Professor is described as 'the latest important example of brilliant cleverness holding a brief for laziness and stupidity.' We do not explain difficulties by multiplying the number of things to be explained.

Ritchie's religious and theological views occupy a good deal of space in this volume. Though a strong liberal, he was opposed to disestablishment, as a move in the wrong direction—'a falling back on the old anarchical liberalism of the Herbert Spencer type.' He throws out the interesting prediction that disestablishment in Scotland 'would give an enormous increase of members to the Scotch Episcopal Church.' In England he thinks that the Roman Catholics would be the only gainers; 'it would not put the Methodist or Baptist socially in any better position.' Ritchie asked very pertinently why a State should not have as good a right to endow a church as an army.

Christianity must be judged by what it is in its highest form. Origin does not determine value, as the Jews supposed who thought to dispose of Christ's claims by asking, 'Is not this the carpenter's son?' The tree is to be known by its fruits, and not by its roots. Christian theology, he says, is nothing but Platonism applied to the beliefs of the first Christians. The doctrine of the Trinity is a valuable recognition that in the Divine itself there is diversity and not merely abstract unity. Accordingly, he has no quarrel with the Athanasian Creed, which he prefers to the others as being more metaphysical and 'less mythological.' What he calls 'mythology' he attributes to the popular tendency to think of eternal relations as if they were particular events in time, and so to state 'value' in terms of 'origin.' He felt acutely the alienation of orthodox sympathies which these views brought upon him, a 'separation from which there comes so much loss, moral and otherwise.' But what he termed the 'heedlessness of truth in the ecclesiastical mind' repelled him when he wished for a reconciliation. His theological position seems to have been not unlike that of T. H. Green, by whose teaching he was undoubtedly influenced.

Professor Latta has given us a sympathetic biographical sketch of his friend, whose short life was as blameless and honourable as it was distinguished. Ritchie was obliged to give lectures mainly on logic, while his real interests were in ethics and politics; but he was able to convince himself that 'the study of the methods of social science is a necessary part of logic,' and we

Digitized by Google

can well believe that this latitude of treatment gave additional interest to a somewhat arid subject.

The editor has allowed the Greek quotations to leave his hands in an unscholarly fashion. Blunders or false accents appear on pages 27, 92, 103, 123, 312, 318 (four errors in eight words). In all other ways he has performed his task well.

IV.—Evolution and Anthropology.

Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity, and Evolution. By R. H. Lock, M.A., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. (London: Murray, 1906.) *7s. 6d.* net.

Mr. Lock has made a notable contribution to the study of the evolution of biological science. In this, as in other domains of thought, opinions are themselves liable and subject to a process of developmental change. This process was particularly active about half a century ago; the intervening years have seen the entrenchment of the ground then secured, and we seem to be entering now upon a fresh phase, the advanced posts of earlier years becoming in their turn the base for these new operations.

Since Darwin's day, the conception of Evolution as the historical process to which the varied forms of life owe their existence has become, so to speak, common property and common knowledge The process can be observed by any intelligent person who cares to watch the growth of plants from seeds, of the frog from the tadpole. The difficulties of Biology become acute when attention is turned to the discovery of the influences that guide and direct the developing germ on its path. Biologists are to-day engaged in attempting to acquire a fuller knowledge of those influences and factors of development. Variation is a phenomenon soon borne upon the student's notice: the variability affecting each part and every organ, even within a group of animals which to a superficial observer appears homogeneous, is quickly brought to light by the employment of accurate methods of comparison. Moreover, it has long been evident that some variations are perpetuated through transmission from parent to offspring, while others arise and end with the life-history of an individual. In tracing evolutionary processes as affecting forms of life, we are in reality following the history of such variations as are, by some means or other, perpetuated through inheritance. Thus Evolution sustained by Variation and Heredity (as an arch by two pillars), is fitly associated with them in Mr. Lock's masterly review.

Digitized by Google

The main problems here considered are two in number. First of all, the origin of variations must be investigated: and again the order or rule of their transmission demands inquiry. Mr. Lock points out that two important schools of thought at present dominate research on these subjects, and he deals in turn with the exponents of Biometry, and with those who pursue the methods of investigation with which the name of Abbot Mendel of Brünn will be ever inseparably associated. The two schools are in some respects absolutely opposed, and Mr. Lock's sympathies are not unnaturally engaged by the Mendelians rather than the Biometricians. For the development of Mendelian researches by Mr. Bateson and the pupils he has gathered round him is the great feature of biological activity in Cambridge at the present time.

If we inquire into the results in so far as the fundamental problem of the origin of variation is concerned, we shall not find very much light thrown upon the subject by the workers in Biometry. They, or at least some of them, appear to premise that new forms arise and have arisen from variations of the type described as continuous. Such variations are not as a rule striking in their divergence from the general stock, and in thus laying stress upon the significance of small divergences, Biometricians can claim the support of Darwin himself, whose solicitude for the claims of such comparatively insignificant divergences has never been quite explained, and was a matter of surprise to Huxley.

Mendelians assume an entirely different position. For them, variation as a phenomenon may present two phases, viz. the continuous, where the differences are insignificant; and the discontinuous, where they are strikingly impressive. Curiously enough, the latter and more aberrant variations shew an astonishing tendency in some cases to be inherited. Thus, while unable to demonstrate the mode of origin of either kind of variety, Mendelians distinguish the strongly-transmissible, which they call Mutations, from the less-distinctly inheritable, which they term Fluctuations. The latter appear in some cases to be produced distinctly by alteration in the conditions of life. To Mutations no such definite origin can be ascribed, but with these, on account of their strong tendency to pass from parent to offspring, the Mendelians are at present much concerned.

The differences between the two schools of thought is seen in their methods. The biometric workers deal with large

Digitized by Google

numbers of individuals, and expressly guard themselves from making a selection of these within the limits of the population they investigate. Any tendency to sampling is deprecated. For the Mendelians, on the other hand, the individual is far more significant, as being the potential founder of a new type, which cannot be swamped. Again, in their results the differences once more assert themselves. Thus Mr. Lock is careful to explain that the chief generalization attained by the biometrical school is the enunciation of a law of ancestral heredity, according to which every ancestor of a particular individual has contributed a quota to his heritable qualities. The followers of Mendel find, on the contrary, that some ancestors may have contributed nothing at all. Yet both modes of thought flourish. Reconciliation might seem distant; nevertheless Mr. Lock is evidently not without hope in this respect, and biologists will welcome the advent of such work as may effect this desirable result.

The pursuit of these two lines of research is the distinctive feature of modern Biology. For this reason it has been thought expedient to attempt, however imperfectly, to give an idea of the two points of view. Lack of space precludes any exposition of the results in detail. Mr. Lock has supplied—we think, most successfully—what was previously a real deficiency. In particular, the most recent results of research on Mendelian lines are clearly stated. The arguments leading to the inference of the segregation of heritable characters in the cells of the sex-glands, the light thrown on otherwise obscure phenomena of the reproductive cycle in various animals, the interpretation of the circumstances of the inheritance of sex, all these are subjects of profound interest, while practical applications, as in the results to the improvement of wheat, are by no means absent. Mr. Lock has condensed an enormous amount of material into a small space, and has done so with success. His treatment of controversial points is eminently fair.

At the Back of the Black Man's Mind: or Notes on the Kingly Office in West Africa. By R. E. DENNETT. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1906.) 10*s.* net.

The Lower Niger and its Tribes. By Major A. G. LEONARD, (London: Macmillan and Co., 1906.) 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

CERTAINLY the perusal of these two books leaves the reader a sadder, if not a wiser man. Both authors have lived many years in West Africa. Both have been impressed with the gross

Digitized by Google

distortion native ideas and institutions undergo when viewed through European spectacles. Both have acquired a considerable knowledge of the conditions of thought and society obtaining in the special regions of their study. And yet both have failed to make a serious contribution to ethnological science. The cause of this result is not hard to find. Valuable as they are, sympathy, enthusiasm and the collection of information are useless without a careful training in, and a rigid application of, scientific method.

These two books are works rather of art than of science. Each bears the impress not so much of external facts which are universal property, as of the internal feelings and preconceptions, the peculiar property of the author. Mr. Dennett, for example, seeks comparisons between the 'six estates of the British Constitution' on the one hand, and six corresponding estates in the kingdom of the Bavili, north of the Congo mouth, and in the kingdom of Benin, on the other. Thus we are led to see 'the full beauty and use of the kingly office,' and thus it is that

> 'while in Africa we find the ruins of what were once great kingdoms wanting in strength to maintain themselves for any length of time free from the gravest internal disorders and so degenerating into a series of enclosed despotisms which in anything beyond the management of village affairs do not contain the principle of representation by the people—so, on the other hand, in Europe democracy has become too powerful, and the people, fast losing sight of the great fundamental truths at the base of all good government, look upon licence as liberty and attack or attempt to disestablish any one of the six great estates which endeavours to curb their so-called liberty' (p. 239).

From analogies in ruling offices it is but a small step to analogies in religious thought. The primary object of Mr. Dennett is to 'show that concurrent with fetishism in Jujuism, there is in Africa a religion giving us a much higher conception of God than is generally acknowledged by writers on African modes of thought.' He states that 'this superstition called fetishism is an overgrowth imposed upon the purer knowledge they [the Bavili] once certainly possessed' (p. 168). By fetishism he means 'the doctrine of spirits embodied in or attached to, or conveying influence through, certain material objects' (p. 92). He compares the position of fetishism on the Congo to the relation of popular Buddhism to Buddhistic philosophy.

Digitized by Google

Interesting and valuable as would be the establishment of such a thesis, no impartial reader can admit that Mr. Dennett has succeeded in his task. Apart from his constant neglect of the suspected influence of early Christian missionaries which he cursorily mentions on pages 2 and 74, Mr. Dennett is always too preoccupied with the axe that he is grinding to sift fact from hypothesis and to resist reading his own interpretation into his observations. To the reviewer, at all events, the following conclusions which the author summarizes in regard to Bini and Bavili philosophy fail to carry conviction.

'We have noted that both the Bini and Bavili in the first place recognise God under the names Oyisa and Nzambi.

'They then recognise that there are two great divisions among things and people. Those created which they connect with God (Oyisa) and those procreated which they connect with the Devil (Eshu) as far as the Bini are concerned, and Bantu Nzambi and Bantua Ndongo so far as the Bavili are concerned. Things of the spirit and things of the body as we should say.

'Then we note that they divide things of the spirit into three parts, and things of the body into three parts or six parts in all.

'Then we have twenty-four powers representing the winds etc., as causative attributes under these two headings.

'After which we have the six formulae, each of twenty-four powers which makes 144 parts in all, *i.e.* seventy-two parts under the spiritual heading and seventy-two parts under the procreating heading.

'And finally we have the twenty-four parts which are the results of the foregoing creative and procreative parts' (pp. 235, 236).

The chapters on law, measures, signs and symbols, on sacred lands, rivers, trees, animals and omens contain many interesting facts, which have been in great part already published by the author in special journals. These facts are of undoubted value, but it is often hard to form an exact estimate of their reliability when the author's preconceptions are so pronounced.

Major Leonard's book on the people of Southern Nigeria suffers not merely from excess of interpretation, but from poverty of fact. He gives us a series of impressionist sketches; the artist is everywhere, but the facts are few and hard to find. Major Leonard must remember that opinions, even of one who claims to have spent ten years in Nigeria, are of small significance in the present state of ethnological science compared with the clear, unvarnished presentation of material. His confidence

Digitized by Google

in his own power of interpretation is sufficiently shewn by the following extract.

'All through life I have possessed the power of living a life which was positively dual in existence, of having within my own entity the capacity of absolute detachment, from either internal or external surroundings, as the case might be. And it was this power that I utilised to its fullest extent when I was in contact with these sons of Nature, which enabled me to meet them, not merely more than half way, but, in reality, on their own ground or dunghill' (pp. 3, 4).

It is interesting to compare Major Leonard's ideas of the people of the Lower Niger with those of Mr. Dennett already quoted:

'We have before us, in the tribes of the Lower Niger, those of the immediate interior more particularly, a state of society which shows a very early and initial stage of civilisation—a state that consists merely of communities which long ago emerged from a condition of mere animalism into the higher and more intelligent one of human savagery, and from this again to the still more intelligent condition of barbarism, which has advanced no higher, but remained undeveloped, if not fossilised, in every way, mental and physical' (p. 61).

We should have liked space to give an account of Major Leonard's views of religion, his belief, *e.g.*, that 'the greater the growth of civilisation or artificiality, the further the distance from the Omnipotent Almighty' (p. 82), or his belief that 'the child is nearer to the Unknown than the man, and the savage than the civilised adult' (p. 83). We could wish that Major Leonard had been as generous with his facts as with his views. We could then have set a truer value on the latter.

V.—History and Antiquities.

The Church of the Fathers. By Leighton Pullan. (London: Rivingtons, 1905.) 5*s*.

Without disparagement of existing handbooks, it must be said that there has been room for a compact and comprehensive statement of the facts of early Church history. Mr. Pullan has filled the gap admirably. He writes clearly and gracefully without wasted words, and with due regard to proportion. Save that a certain number of minor names are admitted, with inevitable loss of space for more important characters, we cannot criticize his arrangement of the subject, and we must praise the care which he has taken that no topic of interest

Digitized by Google

should be omitted. The treatment is that of a whole-hearted disciple of Dr. Bright, and while the book has gained by its debt to that excellent master it has also suffered. The Arian controversy is rendered less intelligible than it might be by Mr. Pullan's ignoring of Dr. Gwatkin's great contribution to its history, the recognition of a purely conservative party. It is a pity that this luminous suggestion, which we had thought was by this time generally welcome, should be neglected. It is more serious that the treatment of the great Christological controversy should follow quite traditional lines. The champions of the faith are presented as so thoroughly in the right all through that they are deprived of the credit of having learned fresh truths as the controversy proceeded. Yet though the creed stood at the end of the debate as it stood at the beginning, Christendom was richer by new light upon old verities, and nothing is more instructive than the study of the growth towards deeper and wider views. And this advance was intimately connected with the philosophical thought of the last generations of paganism. As little as the specifically Christian thought of the present day can be isolated from the general tendencies of reflection, so little can the ancient divines be understood without regard to Aristotle and Plato and their successors. On all this Mr. Pullan is provokingly silent, even in regard to St. Augustine, who was nothing if not a metaphysician. But ancient cleavages in belief were connected quite as intimately with national feelings as with schools of philosophy, and here again Mr. Pullan is silent. Finlay for him has written in vain. Nor are we allowed to learn much concerning the popular religion which really won the day against paganism, not without some compromise with it. The strange superstitions and credulities, the strange pieces of theology, such as that doctrine of redemption by almsgiving of which St. Cyprian was sometimes the preacher and which is the whole burden of Salvian's *Ad Ecclesiam*, are so completely ignored as to give almost an appearance of partisanship to Mr. Pullan's work. He seems to desire to recommend one presentation of Christianity to his own generation by laying stress upon selected aspects of the primitive Church, and there is a positiveness, and even an occasional suggestion of pugnacity, in his tone which is controversial rather than historical. A good text book is all the better if it is useless for the purposes of the advocate.

Digitized by Google

The Political History of England. Vol. IV. From the Accession of Richard II. to the Death of Richard III. (1377–1485). By C. OMAN, Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. (London: Longmans, 1906.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Great Revolt of 1381. By the same. (Oxford: at the University Press, 1906.) 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

PROFESSOR OMAN cannot write anything without being extremely interesting; his style is so simple, so vigorous, and at the same time so free from anything like shipshodness; his eye for a battlefield is almost unique (Sir James Ramsay knows *more* about the fifteenth century, but he cannot describe a battle), nay more, the early promise which was given in his little Life of the 'Kingmaker' of becoming a great delineator of character, is more than fulfilled. His 'Richard III', 'Henry IV', and 'Henry V' are perfect models of what character-drawing should be; if his hand is less certain with Cardinal Beaufort, we must remember that that mysterious personage equally eludes everyone else who tries to draw him. Mr. Oman is at home, as no one else who can write is, in the awful wilderness of royal and baronial relationships, marriages and tenures of the fifteenth century. Most of us if suddenly confronted with the question, 'What do you know of the Duke of Exeter, or the Duke of Gloucester, or some such person, in the fifteenth century?' would not be able to go beyond the answer of the immortal schoolboy, 'He was the king's uncle: he was put to death.' But the Professor knows all about them and knows, moreover, how to temper the dose of this knowledge which he has to administer with a due amount of jam. Finally, he is happy in his choice of a century: anyone who has read his *History of England* can see that Constitutional Law is his bugbear; and there was no constitutional law worth speaking of in the days of Lancaster and York.

It was a grisly age. We remember a delightful play at the old 'German Reeds' in which a ghost from that period appeared to his nineteenth century descendant, and asked, 'Who won, Lancaster or York?' 'I don't remember the match,' said the Squire; 'did they play at Lord's or at Prince's?' 'They played at Kings,' said the ghost. 'Ah, well!' said the Squire, 'I think it was drawn.' Professor Oman shews us well how they played at Kings, and how accurately the participle 'drawn' describes the result. There is, in fact, as a whole, only one fault to be found with the book, and it is this: in the Appendix Professor Oman gives an exhaustive and very valuable analysis

Digitized by Google

of the authorities of the period, and he tells us quite plainly that they are exceptionally meagre and untrustworthy (though he does not suggest, what was perhaps the case, that in such a period as the two Yorkist reigns no chronicler dared to record the truth); but then, having to spin a story out of such very poor materials, he never warns us *in the text* that such and such a point rests on very uncertain evidence. To give but one instance of this: he slurs over the difficulty as to what body of men gave, in June 1483, the semblance of accepting the Duke of Gloucester as King Richard III. He calls it an 'Estates' or an 'Assembly,' and seems to imply that it gave some sort of parliamentary sanction to the usurpation; but we ought either to be told more about it, or to be told that nothing can be known. No doubt there were people in London who had come up to be present at the coronation of Edward V., but, as Mr. Oman tells us, the writs for the Parliament had been countermanded; and what seems most probable is that this assembly was nothing but a packed body of Richard's friends among the London citizens, an appeal to the whole body of whom had proved fruitless on the day before.

The second book before us, *The Great Revolt of 1381*, is a piece of original work of the highest order. Professor Oman was led to investigate the questions connected with this mysterious outbreak, partly by the publication in the *English Historical Review* of the Anonymous Chronicle of St. Mary's York, written by an eye-witness of the revolt, and partly by the untimely death of a young Frenchman, André Réville, who had begun at the Record Office the transcription of the documents connected with the same. By following up the lines indicated by these documents and the Chronicle, and by diligent study of the Poll-tax rolls themselves he has enabled us entirely to rectify our previous conceptions of the causes and results of the outbreak, on which that very dictatorial person Mr. Thorold Rogers believed that he had said the last word. Professor Oman is not one who takes his opinions from others; he is not afraid to say that insurgents who profess to be rising for liberty are sometimes a worthless *canaille*, that governments may be sometimes in the right, that Churchmen are generally harder landlords than laymen. He is wise enough to know that we need seek for no recondite reasons to explain a general outbreak of arson, robbery and murder, if once government is paralyzed. So it was in 1381, and so it would be, were the same paralysis to overtake a modern government, in 1907. Most happily, too, he has been able to

Digitized by Google

illustrate from the story of the former year the truth enunciated by Herbert Spencer, 'The more conditions are ameliorated, the more they are declared to be intolerable.' It was not where Serfdom was most grievous, or grievous at all, that the revolt was worst, but where the labourers were fat and prosperous and wanted to be rid of a few vexatious relics of their former condition. Above all, Professor Oman makes quite clear to us that the Poll-tax of 1381 was only the match that fired the train; anarchy had been in its birth-throes for some years past. The nation was doggedly set on maintaining the French conquests of Edward III., but would not, or could not, find the wealth necessary for the task. Ever since the 'Black Death' strikes and combinations of labourers had been continuous, and the demagogic inciter to strikes was never far off. Among the people who most deserved a hanging, but who unfortunately were let off, were two aldermen of London, who actually admitted the mob to the city and exhorted them to every kind of violence. The seeds of anarchy had not all been ripening in one pod nor on one stem; in the great towns there was jealousy of 'foreigners,' jealousy between rich and poor; in the lesser towns there was clamour for fresh privileges to be granted; everywhere there was hatred of Churchmen and especially of rich abbots, hatred of small manorial fines, *corvées*, *banalités*, hatred of lawyers. But there was no Wycliffite influence at work; the religious fomenters of the insurrection were either madmen like John Ball, who had been trying to foment it for the past twenty years, or friars who were Wycliffe's bitterest enemies. The avowed object of the rioters' hatred was the good but feeble old Archbishop Sudbury, the very man who refused to persecute heretics. (He might have been canonized as a martyr, as the Professor shews us, had he been a persecutor.)

Two great discoveries are wholly due to this latest inquiry into the subject: (1) The number of false returns sent in to the Poll-tax; this was so great and so unblushing that the Government ordered a special commission of inquiry on it. To the Poll-tax of 1377, 1,355,000 names had been returned; four years later the Government was astonished to find that there were not 900,000 persons in England over fifteen years of age! In a few weeks the commissioners collected in Suffolk alone 13,000 suppressed names. (2) The 'merciless repression which followed' the close of the revolt has been utterly exaggerated; some 110 executions can be traced, and there may have been a few more; but even Stubbs was not afraid to speak (without a

Digitized by Google

shadow of evidence) of 'thousands.' Professor Oman has blown all this to the winds.

For the way in which he tells the dramatic story no praise can be too high. The fourth chapter, descriptive of the scene in Smithfield, where the young king faced the rioters, is worthy to rank with the finest pieces of historical writing in the English language. Richard, who was to develop into a hesitating weakling before his end, shewed himself at the opening of his reign one of the greatest kings that ever lived—for he, almost alone of kings in history, faced and vanquished, by sheer courage and readiness, a seething armed mob bent upon the overthrow of himself and of society.

A History of the Inquisition in Spain. By HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL.D. In four volumes. Vols. I. and II. (New York and London: The Macmillan Co. 1906.) 10*s.* 6*d.* each *net.*

THE Spanish Inquisition is the standing example of the success of persecution if efficiently applied. These two volumes shew admirably the means by which this efficiency was from the first secured. Mere divergence of doctrine would hardly have been a sufficient justification for the tyranny of the Holy Office, had there not also been at the outset racial cleavage. The unusual strength of the Jews in Spain early provoked the hostility of the Church. Official persecution and popular fanaticism culminated in their wholesale expulsion in 1492. Meanwhile, however, the previous remedy of forced conversion was proving more dangerous than the disease. In order to exercise their professions, retain their property, or protect their lives the Jews had in thousands professed Christianity. Their ability rapidly took these *Conversos* to the front in Church and State. They filled the great sees and high offices at Court; their wealth tempted the first families of the land to intermarriage. The Spanish nobility was becoming tainted by Hebrew blood, and possibly by Jewish doctrines. Many of the *Conversos* were naturally bad Christians, nursing their old beliefs, and hoping, perhaps, for the day of deliverance. Judaism consisted so largely in the practices of everyday private life that it was especially difficult to detect, except by the aid of servants and near relations. It was to meet this peculiar national danger that the Spanish Inquisition was established with all its mysterious and terrifying agencies. It was essential to success that the

Digitized by Google

accused should be ignorant of the sources of evidence, that they should be deprived of all the ordinary safeguards of the law.

Having explained the origins Dr. Lea passes on with masterly treatment of detail to describe the organization and methods of the Holy Office, its relation to the other elements of the State, its unscrupulous advance towards privilege and pre-eminence, and the chronic hatred excited by its tyranny in all the Spanish possessions of the Crown. Its strength lay in its original organization, in its intensely national character and in its effective centralization under the Inquisitor General and the small Council, called the *Suprema*, which was an integral factor of the Constitution and in immediate and constant contact with the monarchy. The King nominated the Inquisitor General, and though his authority was a delegation from the Pope and he could not, therefore, be dismissed, yet the Crown possessed the means of enforcing resignation. The Suprema in turn had the appointment of all the tribunals and officials throughout Spain; it was strong enough to protect or avenge them, and though it might secretly reprimand, it never allowed its lowliest servants to be publicly disgraced. Thus armed, the Inquisition was able to override the jurisdiction and privilege of the feudal nobles and of the Military Orders; it was almost invariably victorious in its conflicts with the less highly organized ecclesiastical courts, and even with the powerful bureaucracy of the legal classes which centred in the Council of Castile. The civil officials fought courageously and were frequently excommunicated. The King was their national protector, but he usually threw his weight upon the other side, until the advent of the Bourbons produced a distinct reaction. The waste of power entailed by long and embittered contests on trivial matters was fully recognized, and many attempts were made to arrive at a satisfactory Concordat, but when made it was never respected by the Inquisition.

In every department the law of the land was summarily set at naught, for the Suprema was a law to itself, legislating, judging, administering and virtually taxing. Like the ecclesiastical courts in earlier days, it withdrew all classes of offences, which had the remotest connexion with matters of faith, from the ordinary courts; it claimed exclusive jurisdiction over its own officials and servants, whether clerical or lay, in all cases either criminal or civil. Its wealth was great, for not only did it arbitrarily impose enormous fines for very slight offences, but in defiance of the admitted rights of the Crown it retained the products of the confiscations, while at times it

Digitized by Google

even obtained from the Pope a grant of Church property. It is true that in the financial distress of Spain under Philip IV. the Crown turned greedily to the hoarded or annual resources of the Inquisition. With greater or less success members claimed exemption from national and local taxation, even from the much cherished inter-provincial duties at the 'dry ports.' In town markets they demanded the right of priority of purchase, and such perquisites as the offal of beasts killed, insisting, indeed, that if this were inadequate to their needs, additional beasts should be killed for the purpose. They set up shops which undersold or drew custom from the recognized tradesmen, while many of these became Familiars or minor officials to escape payment of debts, to collect claims, or to avoid customs dues. Municipal police regulations and royal sumptuary laws were alike loftily disregarded. Servants of the Inquisition were withdrawn from military service, and objected to the billetting of troops, while they clamoured for the right of bearing arms, which was stringently forbidden by repeated laws. This latter claim was the more unnecessary, as their persons were inviolable, and even an insult to the lowest menial entailed ruinous consequences. Spain was the paradise of etiquette, and precedence was everyone's ideal. In this respect the Holy Office was not uniformly successful. Local tribunals assumed precedence over viceroys and captain-generals, but these were direct representatives of the Crown, and Philip II. sharply rapped the knuckles of the claimants. In the churches quarrels on the right of precedence as between Episcopal and Inquisitorial notices were frequent, and occasionally one was gabbled against the other, or excommunication was drowned by the organ, the choir and congregational outcry. Here the bishops held their own better than in the matter of jurisdiction.

So far we have dealt with the material of Dr. Lea's first volume. The second, published a little later, is divided into four books, relating respectively to jurisdiction, organization, resources and practice. This division seems to entail some redigging of ground already trenched. The successful struggle of the oligarchy of the Suprema with the monarchical instincts of the Inquisitor General on the one hand, and with the subordinate tribunals on the other, might with advantage have come earlier. So much is heard from the first of the unique character of the Familiars, that that admirable chapter would have been welcome at a previous stage. This, moreover, leads directly to one of the most interesting dissertations in these

Digitized by Google

volumes: the craze, that is, for *limpieza*, for purity of blood from Jewish, Moorish or heretical taint. This was early made a qualification for the Familiars, and the mania spread to the monasteries and Military Orders, the chapters and universities, until all important professions and offices were barred to those who could not shew an immaculate genealogy. The one high office for which *limpieza* was not definitely required was, curiously enough, that of the Inquisitor General! This craze was the more absurd as Cardinal Mendoza was probably right in representing to Philip II. that virtually the whole nobility of Castile and Aragon had a strain of Jewish blood. Only the very poor, and the gentry of the roughest mountainous districts of the north and east were quite honestly 'Old Christians.' The taint on the descendants of those who were penanced, however slightly, for heretical or purely moral causes, was of course later. Not one of the results of the Inquisition was more disastrous to the intellectual progress of Spain than this. Yet even till 1860 *limpieza* was requisite for admission to the corps of cadets, and is still believed to be a source of trouble in Majorca.

The questions of jurisdiction here treated turn mainly on the determination to bring the bishops within the power of the Inquisition, and the pivot is the *cause célèbre* of Archbishop Carranza, which receives very full treatment. No reasonable man can doubt that this most excellent of prelates was innocent of heresy, a muddled theologian though he might be. His Commentaries, indeed, remained on the Index until 1900, but they were approved by the Council of Trent, by Pius IV., and by Pius V., who, but for his own untimely death, would undoubtedly have acquitted him. Carranza had warm sympathy in Spain, and his case was a crying scandal throughout Europe; yet for nearly seventeen years he was a prisoner, and this merely to gratify private spite and self-interest in the first case, then the self-pride of the Suprema. The affair evidently weakened the position of the bishops, but the victory of the Inquisition was not definitive. Nor is this surprising when the unusual strength of the Spanish episcopate is considered: strength which was much in evidence during the Council of Trent at this very period. The Papacy itself was no more fortunate, for the struggle against appeals to Rome continued from the earliest days of the Inquisition to the eighteenth century. In this the Crown was whole-heartedly on the side of the Suprema, as, indeed, was probably the nation. If the later

Digitized by Google

and weaker Habsburgs occasionally wavered, the Bourbons lost no time in clinching the claims of the Inquisition.

The resources of the Inquisition are scheduled by Dr. Lea as consisting of confiscations, fines and penances, dispensations, and benefices. This latter extremely important source was due to the skill of Valdés, who in 1559 extracted from the Papacy a brief suppressing one canonry and one prebend in all Cathedral and Collegiate churches, the revenue being applied in perpetuity to the Inquisition. Nor was this all, for the officials were richly endowed with benefices, and granted dispensation from residence, in spite of the honourable traditions of the Spanish Church in this respect, and the courageous and persistent resistance of the Chapters.

Readers will naturally look for the more thrilling and sensational features of the Inquisition in Book VI. upon its practice. This, we venture to think, would have been improved by the inclusion of the chapter on the Edict of Faith, that solemn and ceremonious exhortation to delation which proved so ruinous to Spanish character. The Edict seems awkwardly placed between the conflicts with the Bishops and the Papacy, whereas its natural connexion is with the Edict of Grace, which was the official encouragement to dissidents to inform against themselves. The inquisitorial process follows, and this includes the inviolable secrecy in which the procedure was shrouded, and which was doubtless the main factor in its power. This secrecy was well called in quite recent times the soul of the Holy Office. Arrest was followed by sequestration of all the accused's property pending his trial, and by the secret prison, the most terrible feature of which was the deprivation of the Sacraments. Apart from this Dr. Lea admits that the prisons compared somewhat favourably with those of the secular authorities, although the execution of humane instructions varied with the characters of local officials, while public opinion had no outlet. Where, however, the Inquisition fell far below the standard of the worst contemporary Courts was in the admission of evidence. Every conceivable limitation was placed on the witnesses for the accused, whereas no restrictions, except the fact of a private quarrel, affected those for the prosecution, which welcomed the evidence of the nearest relations, of Jews, of children or even lunatics. The suppression of such witnesses' names contributed to make successful defence impossible. Wholesale false witness was the natural result, and each successive generation of Spaniards was reared in an atmosphere of spying, tale-bearing and perjury.

Digitized by Google

The very conscience was poisoned from the outset by the gross abuses of the confessional for the purposes of the Holy Office.

Dr. Lea proves that from its origin to its very close in the nineteenth century the Inquisition provoked bitter hostility and much actual resistance. This resistance was more open and continuous in the provinces of the Crown of Aragon, where popular institutions long flourished, but it seems to have been scarcely more effectual than in Castile. Why, then, did a high-spirited nation tolerate the tyranny? The scruples imposed by the oath to support the Holy Office which was taken by every functionary from the King downwards must count for something; fear of the consequences of resistance for much more. Terrorism was created by the abuse of excommunication or arrest, by the impossibility of defence, by the eternal infamy of the accused's posterity. Moreover, in spite of hostility, few Spaniards really wished the Inquisition abolished. It was a national institution worked by Spaniards to meet dangers almost exclusively Spanish. The appointment of the German Jesuit Nithard as Inquisitor General under Charles II. provoked the only widespread outbreak. It was worth some sacrifice to boast that, while other nations were rent by religious strife, Spain alone preserved her peace and her unity of faith. The ultimate intellectual consequences were naturally not apparent. It is as difficult for nations as for individuals to recognize their intellectual decline. After all, Protestant Germany in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could shew nothing which could approach the glorious literary and artistic products of Inquisition-ridden Spain.

The Manor and Manorial Records. By N. J. Hone. (London: Methuen and Co., 1906.) *7s. 6d.*

The subject of the Manor, its origin, its administration, and its relation to agriculture, is so vast and as yet so incompletely worked out that it is impossible to give a short and satisfactory account of it. Mr. Hone has faced the difficulty with as much success as any of his predecessors. He is at his best in the point which interests him most, the legal machinery; in regard to the rural life of earlier times he is somewhat indefinite, perhaps from want of familiarity with that of our own day. And we must complain of an occasional want of precision both in thought and in expression. But the plan of his book is good, and his examples well chosen. He begins with a brief history of the

Digitized by Google

manor, leaning to the conclusions of Vinogradoff; it is curious that he does not cite that passage in the Epistle of Bede to Egbert which is the most instructive of all statements concerning the foundation of manors in England. Mr. Hone's survey is wide, but hardly wide enough; he is not aware that in the counties of Nottingham and Dorset, if not in others, there are unenclosed parishes with the three-field system still at work. And his own experience has led him to generalize without sufficient warrant. He regards a demesne scattered among the strips of the yardlands as normal, and no doubt in the records he has studied demesnes thus dispersed have prevailed; but desmesnes in separate and compact blocks are probably as common. He also lays down that free suitors were necessary to constitute a court; but the numerous examples of 'John Freeland, free tenant,' a relation of Doe and Roe, shews that this was only a theoretical requisite and that a legal fiction sufficed in lieu of real men. The account of the arrangement of arable fields is good so far as it goes, but it is too brief to be instructive, and many of the words which are likely to puzzle a beginner are overlooked; 'selion' is omitted in the index, and 'olyard' is altogether neglected. The passages from court rolls are well chosen and well translated, though of course on some points there might be dispute, but they are not sufficiently annotated to help the very readers to whom the book will be most useful. And a good deal that is most interesting is not strictly relevant to the purpose of the book; information is given at length concerning the domestic management of a religious house, concerning popular festivals and the like, which does not help us to understand how manors arose or how they were administered, nor is a very strict line drawn between borough and village. Mr. Hone gives ample proof that certain religious houses were very easy landlords; historical justice required that he should furnish evidence of the extreme unpopularity of others. On the important question of the disappearance of the old system of husbandry he has injured his work by repetition. At two distant points of the book he treats of the matter, with some inconsistency and some waste of space, and fails to give a consecutive account. The obvious consideration of the value of some land for pasture, as in Blackmore Vale, has not struck him. In such districts moderate corn land was turned into rich grass at a very early date; the process was as inevitable as that by which the greensand of Bedfordshire is now being converted from the growth of cereals to that of

Digitized by Google

vegetables. It would be both easy and interesting to trace the disappearance of common fields in different parts at different times, and to connect it with economic considerations. Almost a third of the book is taken up with lists of manuscript material in a few of the chief libraries and in the Record Office. This information is not of an inaccessible kind, and could only be justified by appearing as part of a fairly complete catalogue. But while the rolls in the Bodleian are enumerated, those in the Cambridge Library are ignored, and no mention is made of the rich stores of the older colleges in both Universities. The local names, always a difficult matter, are too often misprinted; a fault which this volume shares with others of the series of 'The Antiquary's Books.' However, it is unkind to make too much of the faults of an interesting and instructive book on a difficult subject. All its readers will profit by it, and those not least who have a previous acquaintance with the subject.

Chertsey Abbey. By LUCY WHEELER. (London: Wells Gardner, 1905.) 6*s*.

THIS is one of those books, well intentioned, nicely printed and prettily illustrated, about which it is kindest to say as little as possible. The progress of the *Victoria History of the English Counties* will, we hope, soon bring them to an end. The writer's single qualification for her task is a laudable admiration for the interesting place of which she treats. She has consulted a fair number of authorities without knowing how to use them, and in fact without any such general acquaintance with English history and ecclesiastical antiquity as to render them intelligible to her. When she is not in error she fumbles her subject vaguely and helplessly. The Latin is as extraordinary as might be expected, and we are not surprised at the absence of references. In most parts of England it is difficult to obtain skilled assistance in such a task, but Chertsey is within a walk of the Royal Holloway College, where the best of guidance is attainable and where the opportunity of applying sound general knowledge to the elucidation of local history would almost certainly have been seized with eagerness. But with all its faults the book contains a good many facts which are of interest concerning one of the most venerable sites in England, and a competent reader will be instructed as well as irritated. A curious preface is contributed by Mr. Justice Swinfen Eady, in which he says that the book contains a 'full history' of the Abbey, and cites Capgrave as an original authority for the life of St. Erkenwald.

Digitized by Google

A Memoir of Archbishop Markham. By Sir CLEMENTS MARKHAM, K.C.B. (Oxford: at the University Press, 1906.) 5s.

WE are grateful for any information concerning the Church in the days of George III. We may read as much as we will of the Methodist and Evangelical movements, but of the lives and views of the Church's leaders, except in so far as they came into contact or collision with the freelances, we can learn little from current literature and that little is usually in a tone of conventional disparagement. Sir Clements Markham had an excellent opportunity of enlightening us in the Life which he has written of his distinguished ancestor. But though his account of the early struggles and early success of the Archbishop is interesting, and though we see something of that hunt for preferment which prevailed in England in a much milder form than in other countries with ancient ecclesiastical endowments, yet of the Church policy of the Archbishop we learn nothing. He occupied two sees from 1771 to 1807 and in that memorable period must have addressed many Charges to the clergy; the use which he made of his patronage, in cases when he was not advancing his own relatives or his old pupils at Westminster, would have taught us what his bias was; there must be numerous references in the theological literature of the day to so prominent an ecclesiastic. But Sir Clements has taken no interest in this, the really significant part of the Archbishop's life. We have instead a number of details which can only be of interest to the Markham family, such as the names of forty-five kinsmen who subscribed to put up a memorial in Westminster Abbey to the Archbishop, with the amount of their subscriptions; we have also an account, which adds little to what is already accessible, of his somewhat stormy political life and of his connexion with Burke and the Prince of Wales. But the book casts many incidental lights upon the ways and thoughts of the age, none of which is more striking than the account of the struggles of the Archbishop's father as a half-pay officer. He copied papers for solicitors and painted fan-mounts which he sold in disguise in the streets. In his poverty he is the exact counterpart of the hero of *Amelia*, and is a proof, if it were needed, of the photographic accuracy with which Fielding has depicted some aspects of the reign of George II. Serious as its omissions are, the book is always interesting and is worthy of its distinguished author and of its subject. But in view of the good fortune of his own family we could wish that he had solved

Digitized by Google

for us the curious problem why York has been so much more successful than Canterbury in founding houses of landed estate.

A History of Modern England. By HERBERT PAUL. Vol. V. (London: Macmillan.) 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

WHEN Dr. Johnson wrote the last *Idler* he told us, in some of the most stately and pathetic words in the English language, of the sadness inseparable from the thought of doing anything for the last time. With Mr. Paul's last volume before us for review, we are bound, in loyalty to the great Doctor, to confess that we are sad. But we must also be loyal to truth, and we have therefore to acknowledge that our regret that we have come to the end is small when we compare it with our disappointment. Mr. Paul is not the first writer who has failed to sustain a fairly high level of excellence when he has attempted to describe events close at hand. But there is an exceptionally large difference of merit between his opening and closing volumes. There was a little more flavour of the historian at the beginning; then we found ourselves with a journalist; and we end on the floor of the House of Commons, and even on the less dignified platform of the electioneer. We do not blame Mr. Paul because he is in the thick of modern politics. But such a man cannot write a book that deserves to be called a history, if he brings it down to the last decade. At the same time, if we take Mr. Paul's writing as we take his speeches, he is lively enough to be entertaining, and quite content enough with his own opinion upon all subjects to arouse the interest and opposition of his readers, as well as, we must suppose, the admiration of his political associates, We need not comment on the leading topics of this last volume, on Home Rule, or Lord Salisbury's foreign policy, on the fall of Mr. Parnell, or the resignation of Lord Randolph Churchill, or Mr. Gladstone's farewell. But as political memory is so short every reader would do well to look at Mr. Paul's account of the arrival of free education in 1891. His chapter on the triumph of ritualism recognizes that a grave constitutional issue lay beneath the Bell-Cox case, and he deals briefly with the case of the reredos at St. Paul's and the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln. The church connected with the last case is incorrectly described by Mr. Paul. It was St. Peter's-at-Gowts, and Gowts means sluices.

An index to the whole work is added to this volume, by which any leading topic can be traced through the second half of the last century, and Mr. Paul's 'conclusion' with its final tone of acceptable imperialism, is not unworthy of him.

Digitized by Google

VI.—General Literature.

The Bookman Illustrated History of English Literature. By Thomas Seccombe and W. Robertson Nicoll. 2 vols. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1906.) 15*s.* net.

So far as we are aware this is distinctly the best popular work on English literature that has so far been put before the public. It is in two folio volumes, from Chaucer to Dryden, and from Pope to Swinburne respectively. The editor of the *Bookman*, Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll, has entrusted them to Mr. Thomas Seccombe, who with an admirable and taking style, and facile pen carries us swiftly along through 522 pages, in which the story of our literature is shewn to be continuous, and those who have made it are conjured up before us with life-like presentment and clear delineation. Though intentionally a popular book, it is popular in the best sense, appealing to the student as well as to the general reader, since it has the advantage of being thoroughly up to date, and of containing the results of special research. On disputed points we find ourselves generally in agreement with the views which Mr. Seccombe puts forward or adopts, and, where argument is necessary, his remarks are made in judicious language which has the ring of honest conviction, arrived at by original investigation. The value of the book to the student is increased by the footnotes, and by the critical summaries appended to many of the chapters. In both, the bright, attractive style of the main narrative is kept up, and the eye of the reader glides from the larger to the smaller print, without any sense of having fallen from interesting description to dry-as-dust annotation. The generalizations and summaries strike us as well-advised. We may refer to those on Macaulay, pp. 429–430, Matthew Arnold, pp. 506–507, and Walter Pater, p. 508, as samples of individualities oftenest brought to the bar of miscellaneous and general criticism.

The book is thoroughly sound and healthy in tone from beginning to end, and is the work of one who knows and loves what he is writing about. The student of special sections will find, often what may be new to him, always something so put as to be worth remembering. Nowhere will this assertion be found more true than in the chapters where most readers may expect to find themselves on familiar ground—the Elizabethan age. The chapter on Shakespeare is particularly fascinating, and will probably be the most popular in the book. It will bear reading many times over, and it is only fair to say that every

Digitized by Google

other part of the two volumes is equally well written. The style is clear, engaging, happy in metaphor and suggestion, and uninterruptedly pleasing.

Where there is so much to praise, it may seem ungenerous to carp at details, but there is one point to which we must call attention. The author is very fond of using sparkling Gallicisms, and for the most part they fit well into his congenial style. In the second volume they come pretty thickly, and here and there they need revision. For example, on pp. 411–412, we find 'cavalier servante,' on p. 413 (footnote), 'revoltés,' on p. 427, 'resumés.' These may be 'fautes d'impression,' but what shall we say of 'menus plaisiris,' on p. 414? Is not this, apart from the printer's error, the French for 'pocket-money'? Should it not be 'menus propos,' 'small talk'? And why should Villon masquerade as 'Françoise'? Again, at Pisa, the official spelling of 'Lung' Arno,' p. 412 and elsewhere, is 'Lung-arno.' Also, on p. 399, in a list of De Quincey's works we find 'Casuistry of Roman *Morals*' usurping the place of 'Casuistry of Roman Meals.' No doubt these small points will be set right in the next edition.

The fifty-one beautiful full-page photogravures, make the book in view of its size remarkably cheap, and we thank Mr. Seccombe for the pleasure his work has given us.

Edward FitzGerald. By A. C. BENSON, Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. 'English Men of Letters' series. (London: Macmillan, 1905.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

ON this little biography as much skill in the handling and distinction of style have been expended as would justify a larger book. It is not exactly cheerful reading. FitzGerald, though Celt or Norman rather than Saxon, belonged to the tribe of eccentrics, lovable odd fellows, 'characters,' or even 'quizzes,' that used to be taken as peculiarly English in the days of Voltaire and Goldsmith. Our pretentious modern speech would call him, truthfully enough, a decadent or an anarchist; for he was idle, unfit to make a living, lawless, and not to be managed by authority in any shape. He wasted years in trifling, married without love on a sort of punctilio, dressed and lounged like Diogenes, hid away in a den where he smoked and read the classics down by the wild North Sea, and just wrote a letter or scribbled at a translation when the fit took him. Yet he was tender-hearted, not cynical; and Thackeray, Tennyson, even grim old Carlyle, returned the affection he somehow insisted on

Digitized by Google

their sharing. All this would not have made him famous. But, by one of the strangest freaks in literature, FitzGerald, pottering about among Persian rhymers, and not half understanding them, stumbled upon the quatrains of Omar Khayyam. By magic touches he so transformed that mediæval astronomer-sceptic as to do for him what no other English versifier has done for any exotic poet, and Omar can never henceforth cease to be quoted in our Golden Treasury as a native singer. Thousands are well up in his 'Rubaiyat' who know about Persian not a syllable more than FitzGerald has chanted to them; but so much they know by heart, and in a defiant mood believe, taking the music for gospel.

If a gain to English letters, that happy *tour de force* cannot be thought of without misgivings. It just enabled the average foolish person to say in his heart 'There is no God.' And saying it so daintily, with such ingenious yet simple turns, the holiday-maker fancied himself original. But it was 'old Fitz,' not the London clubman, who shewed originality: once and once only, as Mr. Benson well remarks; for the translations from Calderon or Æschylus fail precisely where Omar triumphs: they have no blood in their veins. FitzGerald's diffidence, trembling shyness before the shadow of reality, yearning after love, sentimentalism, sharp insight, caprice, perverseness, these things which remind us of the illustrious failures of Gray, Senancour, Amiel, according to the aspect in which we regard our hermit, find excellent definition here. The chapters on 'Criticism' and 'Habits and Character' tell us all we need remember of one whose judgements were penetrating or subtle, but often narrow, pettish, unreasoning. This doubter and deserter from the battle of men, skulking in dark corners, timid as Gray, whom he admired, freakish as Charles Lamb, whose writings pleased him more and more, leaves upon us a sense of futility, regret, almost, at certain crises, of contempt, but in the end of boundless pity. Does he prove anything at all? Perhaps that literature is not the key to life; and surely that faith alone leads to action.

Walter Pater. By A. C. Benson. 'English Men of Letters' Series. (London: Macmillan and Co. 1906.) 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

Mr. Benson has exercised a wise discrimination in giving us a chronological and critical description of Pater's works rather than a biography of the man. For in such a biography, what would there have been to say? Pater was educated like most well-to-do young Englishmen; he gained a Second Class and was

Digitized by Google

a somewhat ineffective College Tutor; he was satirized in the 'New Republic'; he passed his time between Oxford and London, with occasional travels in Italy and elsewhere; he never married; he died somewhat suddenly in 1894; and that is nearly all. Yet in himself, especially in the 'self' exhibited in his works, he was an intensely interesting man; a man of well-defined limitations (for he cared nothing for science or politics, and, within the sphere of literature, was but slenderly endowed with the dramatic instinct); but, within those limitations, of very high mental and spiritual endowments.

After his 'artistic conversion,' on his first visit to Italy, his interest in metaphysics (originally his favourite study) gradually slackened, except so far as they could be made to bear on art or on personality. For it was the moral and intellectual beauty of art, its influence on character in the largest sense of the word, that was his constant subject. This it was which constituted his message to his generation. In the words of his biographer, he learned (and therefore taught others) 'to see, with an impassioned zest, the truth that in art, and life alike, the victory is with those who attain to a certain patient and appreciative attitude of soul; who learn through careful toil . . . to discriminate between what is facile, impressive, specious, and what is deep, permanent, sincere.' We are told that his knowledge of Italian art was 'superficial.' Probably 'partial' and 'limited' would be better epithets; for his studies of painters were careful and thorough. They were not, however, technical; and Mr. Benson justly says that wrong attributions of pictures to painters, which are not uncommon with him, really affect very little the value of his work.

But, after all, it is in his literary style that his supreme excellence consists. Based partly on French, partly on English models, it became eventually a thoroughly individual possession, instinct with meaning, beauty, and poetry. It was not perfect; for it was artificial, often involved, and generally wanting in directness and simplicity. What he thought prose ought to be, what no doubt he aimed at himself, he shews us where he describes a style 'austere, ornate, argumentative, fanciful, yet true from first to last to the vision within.' But style, however individual, is liable to be deflected from its course—to shew signs of foreign influence. Pater, we are rightly told, had nothing in common with Carlyle; and yet it is not difficult occasionally to recognize a touch of Carlylese. He himself

Digitized by Google

declined to read Stevenson and Rudyard Kipling, believing that their styles were strong, and 'they might lead me out of my path.' Mr. Benson, again, has an easily recognizable style; yet in this book it is hard to think that it has not been affected by its subject. We cannot, for instance, believe that if he had been writing on another theme he would have talked of 'a tender aloofness, a spectacular dreamfulness.'

Walter Pater was a high-minded man, of simple life, devoted to authorship as his work of life, and deeply impressed with his responsibility as an author. His attitude to the Christian religion is rather difficult to understand. He was sincerely attached to it; he accepted it as an inspiration of life; but, at the same time, dogma in his mind was hardly rated higher than a 'possibility.' Religion, however, was by no means the only sphere of thought in which ideas were more to him than facts.

Altogether Mr. Benson has produced an excellent book—appreciative and suggestive. His *obiter dicta* set one thinking, though one cannot always agree with them. For instance, it is an imperfect description of Gothic architecture to describe it as 'beauty feeling its way out of barbarism into a certain ecclesiastical and traditional grace.' We should like also to suggest to him that the young athletes whom he sees around him at Cambridge, whatever their limitations, are at least neither 'gloomy' nor 'commercial.' What, again, is the exact meaning (p. 82) of 'haunted emphasis'? And what is the difference (p. 202) between 'pontifical' and 'sacerdotal'? and why is it, apparently, right to be the first and wrong to be the second? These, however, are small matters, and do not diminish our gratitude to the writer for performing with such success a difficult task: difficult, because the usual resources of a biographer are wanting, and because the charm of the subject, though very real, is so subtle and so elusive.

Life of S. Teresa. Written by herself. Translated from the Spanish by DAVID LEWIS. Third edition, enlarged. With additional Notes and an Introduction by Rev. Fr. BENEDICT ZIMMERMAN. (London: T. Baker.) 8*s.* net.

THE latest edition of this well-known translation differs only from its predecessors in having the advantage of Father Zimmerman's interesting introduction and the arguments of the chapters written by St. Teresa herself. Lesser mortals have so long been strangers to the spirit of humble detachment (at all events to the same degree)

Digitized by Google

that they feel a shock in reading that the Saint describes certain chapters as 'most profitable and noteworthy,' and containing 'excellent doctrine,' and have hastily assumed that, since it appears to them unsaintly so to write, St. Teresa cannot so have written. The publication in 1873, at Madrid, of a photographic reproduction of the Saint's autograph has, however, proved that they were mistaken. How far more clearly than they, St. Teresa understood the Apostolic injunction 'not to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think, but to think soberly,' is proved by her writing these arguments in the first place; and, in the second, by her having drawn her pen, with touching *naïveté*, through such expressions as 'In an excellent manner,' 'This is most admirable,' which appear scored through in the MS. The photographic reproduction further reveals that nearly a thousand inaccuracies have crept into the edition followed by Mr. Lewis. Most of them, Father Zimmerman allows, are immaterial, but it seems unfortunate that his agreement with the owners of the copyright should preclude his correcting them by the authentic version, binding him, as it does, to reproduce exactly the text and notes of Mr. Lewis without any change.

Father Zimmerman calls attention to various interesting points which have been established recently, one of the more important being the real date of St. Teresa's profession, now proved to have been made on November 3, 1536, two years later than the date generally given. St. Teresa's habit of communicating once a fortnight has been ascribed by Mr. Lewis to the laxity of the convent, and not, as is the case, to the infrequency of communions in those days, when once a month was the rule for a good religious. Thankful as we may rightly be for the excellence of Mr. Lewis' translation, a preference for accuracy cannot be wholly satisfied until careful collation with the original has produced, if not an improved, an authentic, edition.

A History of English Poetry. By W. J. COURTHOPE, C.B. Vol. V. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1905.) 10*s.* net.

THE fifth volume of Mr. Courthope's history brings him to that period in our literature with which his own name is principally associated, the period of the eighteenth century of which the protagonist is Pope. In this period Mr. Courthope sees at once the full development of the Classical Renaissance which began as far back as the fourteenth century, and the literary counterpart of the Whig victory of 1688. We cannot profess ourselves fully in accord here with his philosophy of literature. The principle is laid down that 'the Renaissance stimulates artistic invention

Digitized by Google

in free communities, but overlays national originality with imitated classic forms in States deprived of their political freedom.' It will probably not be disputed that England in the eighteenth century was a free community; nevertheless we suspect that to most readers the second clause in the sentence just quoted will seem to give a truer description of the literature of that period than the first. This, however, is not Mr. Courthope's view. He regards the Elizabethan and Stuart literature as representing a conflict between mediæval and classical elements, ending with the triumph of the latter, to which we owe a great age of constructive development, the results of which will bear comparison with those of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. In particular, he appropriates to the school of Pope, and especially to Goldsmith, Mr. S. H. Butcher's panegyric on the Attic style at its best.

In spite of this lofty estimate, which will hardly be universally accepted, Mr. Courthope's presentation of the various poets with whom he has to deal in this volume cannot be called unduly eulogistic. The services which they rendered to English literature, by purging it of obscure turgidity and strained conceits, and by establishing a standard of plain colloquial idiom, are indisputable, and are not over-emphasized in themselves; but what we seem to miss is a recognition of the fact that clearness of expression and mastery of colloquial idiom are not the heart of the whole matter, and that the greater gifts of soul, of imagination, of inspiration were denied to the poets of the eighteenth century, or were present in a far less degree than in their predecessors or successors. This may be due in part to Mr. Courthope's own taste and temperament, but in part also it seems to arise from the general plan of his history. His object is to trace the main currents of literature, to connect them with their social and political surroundings, to explain the rise and fall of great movements of thought, not to estimate the height and power of the inspiration of individual poets. It is a history of poetry, not of poets; and we are not entitled to demand qualities which lie outside the scheme of the work. Nevertheless Mr. Courthope is somewhat to blame for the misconception, since he gives short biographical sketches of all the principal, and many of the minor, poets of this and other periods; and in these it is difficult not to look for something more of personal appreciation, of recognition of the quality and scale of personal inspiration, than we find in this volume or its predecessors.

The general characteristics of Mr. Courthope's history are

Digitized by Google

sufficiently known from his previous volumes, which have been reviewed at length in these columns; and in a short notice it is unnecessary to say more of them. He is not an inspiring guide to English poetry, but he is a thoughtful historian of it. At times his generalizations appear somewhat forced and laboured; and it is not to be expected that all his estimates of individual poets will meet with the assent of every critic. Nevertheless his History is a great and honourable enterprise, carried out with unflinching patience and conscientious zeal; and we shall look with interest for the concluding volume of it, which is to deal with the Romantic Revival.

PERIODICALS.

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. VIII. No. 31. April 1907. Frowde). Sir H. H. Howorth: 'The Origin and Authority of the Biblical Canon according to the Continental Reformers. I. Luther and Karlstadt.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'Codex Taurinensis (Y), VIII.' J. W. Thompson: 'On the Identity of Bernard of Cluny.' With a Genealogical Table. T. W. Crafer: 'Macarius Magnes, a neglected Apologist.' Mgr. G. Mercati: 'More Spanish Symptoms: The Date of some Prayers in the Mozarabic Missal. The Revision of the Toledan Missal in the VIIth century. A Supposed *Liber Officiorum* of Hilary of Poitiers.' With a correction of *J. T. S.* viii 283 by Mr. Edmund Bishop. Bishop of Ely: 'The Date of the Apocalypse: the Evidence of Irenaeus.' H. J. Lawlor: 'Hegesippus and the Apocalypse.' F. C. Burkitt: 'Four Notes on the Book of Enoch.' V. M'Nabb: 'St. Mark's Witness to the Virgin Birth.' E. F. Brown: 'I Peter v 9.' E. Nestle: 'In Memoriam Iohannis Millii, S. T. P.' F. C. Burkitt: 'Harnack *Sprüche u. Reden Jesu.*' J. Ll. Davies: Westcott *Ephesians.*' H. F. Stewart: 'Lucius *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche.*' Dom Connolly: 'Duval *Les Homiliae Cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche*, lii–lvii.' F. R. Tennant: 'Höffding *Philosophy of Religion*'; 'F. Sewall *Reason in Belief*'; 'Koelle *The Goal of the Universe*'; 'F. H. Woods *For Faith and Science*'; 'Sterrett *Freedom of Authority*'; 'Goguel *W. Herrmann et le Problème religieux actuel*'; 'Storr *Development and Divine Purpose.*'

The Expositor (Nos. 16–18. April–June 1907. Hodder and Stoughton). J. B. Mayor: 'Virgil and Isaiah: an Inquiry into the Sources of the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil.' A. Carr: 'The Testimony of St. John to the Virgin Birth of our Lord.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'The Demonology of the Old Testament.' J. Rendel Harris: 'A Further Note on the Cretans.' See Oct. 1906. Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'Pisidian Antioch' (*continued*). A. Mansur: 'The Site of Capernaum.' Tell Hum. E. E. Kellett: 'Some Notes on Christian Dioscurism.' May. W. Sanday: 'St. Paul's Gospel: an Eirenicon.' A notable review of 'W. P. du Bose *The Gospel according to St. Paul.*' Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'The Oldest Written Gospel.' Reviews. 'Harnack *Sprüche u. Reden.*' J. H. Bernard: 'The Connexion between I Cor. v, vi.' J. Rendel Harris: 'A Speculation in Textual Criticism.' Luke xiv 5. Not 'a son' nor 'an ass' but 'a pig'! A. Souter: 'The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of St. Paul.' L. B. Radford:

Digitized by Google

'Distinctions of External Function in the Holy Trinity.' J. Moffatt: 'Notes on Recent New Testament Study' (*continued* June). June. A. Westcott: 'The Divisions of I John: a Correspondence between Drs. Westcott and Hort.' J. Iverach: 'Pantheism.' A. E. Garvie: 'The Desolation of the Cross.' W. O. E. Oesterley: 'The Demonology of the Old Testament illustrated from the Prophetical Writings.' C. H. W. Johns: 'The Assuan Aramaic Papyri.' Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'The Divine Child in Virgil: a Sequel to Professor Mayor's Study.'

The Hibbert Journal (Vol. V. No. 3. April 1907. Williams and Norgate). R. J. Campbell: 'The Aim of the New Theology Movement.' 'Latinus': 'The Aim of the New Catholic Movement.' Sir O. Lodge: 'A Reformed Church as an Engine of Progress.' F. I. Paradise: 'The Living Church.' E. A. Sonnenschein: 'The New Stoicism.' 'Between Death and Life.' A. E. Garvie: 'Personality in God, Christ, Man.' R. J. Ryle: 'The Neurotic Theory of the Miracles of Healing.' C. T. Ovenden: 'The Forgiveness of Sin.' E. A. Rumball: 'The Sinlessness of Jesus.' F. Palmer: 'The Christ of the Fourth Gospel.' B. A. Millard: 'The Theology of "The Average Man."' G. Galloway: 'What do Religious Thinkers owe to Kant?' Discussions. Reviews. R. A. Duff: 'Gwatkin *The Knowledge of God.*' A. C. Haddon: 'W. H. R. Rivers *The Todas.*' M. Rhys: 'S. Reinach *Cultes, Mythes et Religions.*' L. R. Farnell: 'Frazer *Adonis, Attis and Osiris.*' W. H. Drummond: 'J. Rivière *Le Dogme de la Rédemption*' and 'G. B. Stevens *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation.*' R. R. Rusk: 'Boyce Gibson *Euchen's Philosophy of Life.*' W. R. Boyce Gibson: 'A. L. Lilley *Adventus Regni.*' C. H. Toy: 'Addis *Hebrew Religion.*' St. G. Stock: 'Rickaby *Free Will and Four English Philosophers.*' N. H. Marshall: 'J. Clifford *The Ultimate Problems of Christianity.*'

The American Journal of Theology (Vol. XI. No. 2. April 1907. Chicago University Press). S. L. Gulick (and others): 'Should the Denominational Distinctions of Christian Lands be perpetuated on Mission Fields?' L. Arpee: 'An actual Experiment in Non-Sectarian Missionary Activity.' A. O. Lovejoy: 'The Origins of Ethical Inwardness in Jewish Thought.' E. O. Sisson: 'The Spirit and Value of Prussian Religious Instruction.' S. J. Case: 'Paul's historical Relation to the first Disciples.' C. M. Mead: 'What is meant by the Divinity of Man?' H. W. Wright: 'Can the Human Character of Jesus be called Divine?' D. Menant: 'Influence of Max Müller's Hibbert Lectures in India.' J. Horsch: 'Luther's Attitude towards the Principle of Liberty of Conscience.' J. M. P. Smith: 'Marti *Die Religion des A.T.*' and 'Baentsch *Altorientalischer u. israelitischer Monotheismus.*' C. Johnston: 'E. A. Wallis Budge *The Egyptian Heaven and Hell.*' A. Fairbanks: 'W. Otto *Priester u. Tempel im hellenistichen Aegypten*, I.' C. Clemen: 'Was Jesus an Historical Character?' J. W. Bailey: 'S. Monteil *Essai sur la Christologie de S. Paul.*' E. C. Richardson: 'Leipoldt *Didymus der Blinde von Alexandria.*' G. H. Gilbert: 'A. L. Feder *Justins des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus.*' E. A. Bechtel: 'E. K. Rand *Johannes Scottus.*' F. Johnson: 'T. M. Lindsay *The Reformation*, I'; 'H. C. Lea *History of the Inquisition of Spain*, II'; 'H. Barge *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt*'; 'N. Samter *Judentaufen im 19 Jahrhundert.*' C. H. Moehlmann: 'Grütz-

Digitized by Google

macher *Hieronymus.*' H. W. Wright: 'Some Interpretations of the Supernatural.' A. K. Parker: 'Dinnis *Christian Missions and Social Progress*, III.'

The Princeton Theological Review (Vol. V. No. 2. April 1907. Princeton University Press). J. Orr: 'Some Recent Developments in Criticism and Theology.' H. M. Wiener: 'The Laws of Deuteronomy and the Arguments from Silence.' J. P. Hoskins: 'German Influence on Religious Life and Thought in America during the Colonial Period, II.' J. Szlupas: 'Lithuania and its ancient Calvinistic Churches.' S. Zandstra: 'The Theory of Ancestor Worship among the Hebrews.' Reviews. B. B. Warfield: 'McTaggart *Some Dogmas of Religion*'; 'Conybeare and Stock *Selections from the LXX*'; 'V. Fritzsche *Das Berufsbewusstsein Jesu*'; 'H. C. Vedder *Balthasar Hübmaier, the Leader of the Anabaptists*'; 'E. Doumergue *Jean Calvin*, III.' H. C. Minton: 'W. L. Walker *Christian Theism and a Spiritual Monism.*' G. Macloskie: 'G. F. Wright *Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History.*' J. D. Davis: 'J. Orr *The Problem of the Old Testament with Reference to recent Criticism.*' J. G. Machen: 'L. M. Sweet *The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ.*' R. Janssen: 'S. Goebel *Die Reden unseres Herrn nach Johannes im Grundtext*, I.' F. W. Loetscher: 'G. Hodgson, *Primitive Christian Education*'; 'Lindsay *The Reformation*, I.' C. R. Erdman: 'A. Maclaren *Expositions of Holy Scripture.*'

The Dublin Review (Vol. CXL. No. 281. April 1907. Burns and Oates). Bishop of Limerick: 'Irish University Education.' V. McNabb 'The Future of the Free Churches.' J. S. Phillimore: 'Asclepiades.' 'For Truth or for Life.' Dom A. Hamilton: 'Buckfast Abbey: a Mediaeval Chronicle.' Viscount St. Cyres: 'The Précieuses.' B. C. A. Windle: 'De Vries and the Theory of Mutation.' 'The Story of a Paris Convent.' (Les Carmes.) B. Collingwood: 'The Task before the Anti-Vivisectionists.' 'Anti-Clericalism in France.' 'The Victory of the German Centre Party.' Reviews. 'Maturin *Laws of the Spiritual Life.*' 'Towle *J. M. Neale.*' 'Nielsen *History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century.*' 'Ollé-Laprune *La Raison et le Rationalisme.*' 'Fr. Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. *S. Margaret of Cortona.*' B. C. A. W[indle]: 'Bastian *The Evolution of Life.*' 'Lock *Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity and Evolution.*'

The Jewish Quarterly Review (Vol. XIX. No. 75. April 1907. Macmillan). W. Bacher: 'The Origin of the Jewish Colony of Syene (Assuan).' B. Ibry: 'H. N. Byàlik and his Poems.' R. Gottheil: 'An Eleventh Century Document concerning a Cairo Synagogue.' With Maps. I. H. Hersch: 'The French Revolution and the Emancipation of the Jews.' R. H. Charles and A. Cowley: 'An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs.' With Fascimile from MS. Bodl. Hebr. C. 27. Reviews. G. Margoliouth: 'Neubauer-Cowley *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Bodleian Library*, II.' A. Wolf: 'Karpeles *Jews and Judaism in the XIXth Century.*' H. J. Loewe: 'Montague *Tales from the Talmud*' and 'Rapaport *Tales and Maxims from the Midrash.*' W. Bacher: G. Aicher *Das A.T. in der Mischna.*' V. Aptowitzer: 'D. H. Müller *Das syrisch-römische Rechtsbuch und Hamurabi.*'

The London Quarterly Review (No. 214. April 1907. C. H. Kelly).

Digitized by Google

G. G. Findlay: 'Faith: a Bible Study.' A. Burnet: 'South Africa's Greatest Problem.' The Native Question. A. J. Costain: 'The Present Position of Materialism.' D. A. de Mouilpied: 'Lamennais: a Tormented Soul.' W. A Cornaby: 'Protestant Missions in China.' H. T. Hooper: 'Presuppositions.' S. M'Comb: 'The Modern Attitude towards Belief in a Future Life.' W. B. FitzGerald: 'A Literary Resurrection.' Thomas Traherne. 'Sir Oliver Lodge's Catechism.' Reviews. 'E. F. Scott *The Fourth Gospel.*' Unfavourable. 'J. Agar Beet *Manual of Theology.*' 'W. R. Inge *Personal Idealism and Mysticism.*' 'H. J. C. Knight *The Temptation of our Lord.*' 'Dale *History of English Congregationalism.*'

The Expository Times (Vol. XVIII. Nos. 7–9. April–June 1907. T. and T. Clark). G. G. Findlay: 'The Inner Life of Jeremiah' (*continued* May–June). A. A. Brockington: 'Some Characteristics of Old Testament Miracles.' A. Deissmann: 'The New Testament in the Light of recently discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World' (*continued*). S. R. Driver: 'Notes on the Book of Judges.' W. Ewing: 'The Mount of Transfiguration.' Jebel Jermuk. A. Souter: 'The Relationship between Titus and Luke.' Brothers. Reviews. J. Moffatt: 'Steinmann *Die Abfassungszeit des Galaterbriefes.*' J. Lindsay: 'Dorner *Die Entstehung der christlichen Glaubenslehren.*' H. R. Mackintosh: 'Monteil *La Christologie de S. Paul*, I.' 'A. G. Leonard *The Religion of Nigeria.*' 'J. B. Mayor *The Epistle of Jude and II Peter.*' 'A. T. Clay *Archaeology of the Old Testament.*' May. F. Blass: 'The Origin and Character of our Gospels' (*continued* June). W. O. E. Oesterley: 'The Dove with the Olive-leaf (Gen. viii 8–11).' W. H. Griffith Thomas and J. Gilroy: 'Hosea xi 7.' W. B. Stevenson: 'Was the Ark Jehovah's Throne?' 'J. A. Bain: 'II Cor. iv 3–4.' 'In the *things* that are perishing.' E. P. Boys-Smith: 'Titus and Luke.' E. Nestle: (1) 'Pashhur = Magor-missabib'; (2) 'Sufficit diei malitia sua'; (3) 'Why are Two Books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles in our Bibles?'; (4) 'The true Number of Verses in the New Testament.' 7957. Reviews. 'W. C. Allen *St. Matthew.*' 'G. Salmon *The Human Element in the Gospels.*' T. Kappstein: 'Harnack *Sprüche u. Reden Jesu.*' J. S. Banks: 'Bousset *Die Religion des Judentums.*' A. Souter: 'A. Seeberg *Die beiden Wege u. das Aposteldekret.*' 'Lindsay *The Reformation*, II.' 'Schiller *Studies in Humanism.*' 'L. T. Hobhouse *Morals in Evolution.*' June. J. Rendel Harris: 'Marcion and the Canon.' J. A. Selbie: 'W. C. Allen *St. Matthew.*' C. Field: 'Mohammedan Conversions.' A. H. Sayce: 'The Purchase of the Cave of Machpelah.' Dom H. Höpfl: 'II Cor. iv 3–4.' C. H. W. Johns: 'The Babylonian God Ninib.' E. König: 'Has the name "Jahweh" been discovered on the Babylonian Monuments?' V. McNabb: 'St. Thomas Aquinas on the Proofs of the Resurrection.' Reviews. L. A. Muirhead: 'L. Vaganay *Le Problème eschatologique dans le IV^e livre d'Esdras.*' J. Iverach: 'J. B. Baillie *The Idealistic Construction of Experience.*'

The Interpreter (Vol. III. No. 3. April 1907. Simpkin, Marshall). C. F. Burney: 'The Rise of a Belief in a Future Life in Israel.' F. J. Foakes-Jackson: 'Israel and Persia,' III. T. Hodgkin: 'Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees.' F. R. Tennant: 'Points of Contact between Theology and Science of the Present Day,' III. S. L. Brown: 'Amos: the Man and his Message.' C. W. Emmet: 'The Problem of

Digitized by Google

the Apocalypse and its Bearing on the Conception of Inspiration.' J. B. Turner: 'Who was "The Rich Young Ruler"? a Suggestion.' St. Mark, as also 'the goodman of the house.' Reviews. 'W. M. Ramsay *Pauline and other Studies.*' 'Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, I.'

The Review and Expositor (Vol. IV. No. 2. April 1907. Louisville, Ky.). L. Burrows: 'J. P. Boyce.' N. K. Davis: 'The Possibility of Miracles.' B. H. de Ment: 'The Contribution of Sunday School Pedagogy to Spiritual Equipment.' J. S. Dill: 'Puritan Rule in Colonial Virginia.' L. W. Doolan: 'Practicality in Theological Training in the United States.' Mrs. J. G. Roach: 'I John: a Study of the New Life.' W. T. Whitley: 'The Story of Missions in Five Continents.' Reviews. E. C. Dargan: 'W. R. Nicoll *The Lamp of Sacrifice*'; 'J. Iverach *The Other Side of Greatness*'; 'Garvie *Guide to Preachers.*' W. J. McGlothlin: 'J. P. Whitney *The Reformation*'; 'Overton and Relton *The English Church, 1714–1800.*' E. Y. Mullins: 'N. H. Marshall *Theology and Truth*'; 'Schmid *The Scientific Creed of a Theologian*'; 'D. S. Cairns *Christianity in the Modern World*'; 'J. Moses *Pathological Aspects of Religious Experience*'; 'J. Nink *Jesus als Charakter.*' W. O. Carver: 'Sterrett *Freedom of Authority.*' B. H. de Ment: 'Beeching and Nairne *The Bible Doctrine of the Atonement.*' A. T. Robertson: 'Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*'; 'Sweet *The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ.*'

The Albany Review [formerly *The Independent Review*] (Vol. I. Nos. 1–3. April–June 1907. John Lane). E. Carpenter: 'The Land Question in a Country Parish.' G. W. E. Russell: 'Ritualism and Disestablishment.' G. F. McCleary: 'The Work of the Health Visitor.' S. A. Savinkov: 'A Russian Mother: a Personal Narrative, 1897–1905' (*continued* May). May. P. Sabatier: 'The Bishops' Declaration of January 1907: a significant Episode in the Struggle between France and the Holy See.' E. Givskov: 'Small Holdings and Land Taxation.' Danish experience. D. MacCarthy: 'A. Symons *Studies in Seven Arts.*' C. F. Keary: 'Positivism.' June. F. Y. Eccles: 'Ferdinand Brunetière, 1849–1906.' D. C. Pedder: 'A Perishing Country-side.' T. H. S. Escott: 'The Story of *The Times.*' D. MacCarthy: 'De Bertouch *Life of Fr. Ignatius.*' A. W. Verrall: 'The Birth of Virgil.' O. Festy: 'The Labour Movement in France.' W. Dewar: 'The Protective Coloration of Birds: a Fallacy.' H. W. Horwill: 'The Mormon Investigation.' E. J. Urwick: 'Cross Currents in Philanthropy.'

The Quarterly Review (No. 411. April 1907. John Murray). 'Labour and Socialism in Australia.' B. Taylor: 'The Income Tax.' 'Newman and Manning.' Sir F. Pollock: 'F. W. Maitland.' 'The First Earl of Lytton.' P. Hume-Brown: 'The Character of Goethe.' J. C. Bailey: 'John Evelyn.' 'The Irish University Question.' J. C. Ewart: 'The Derivation of the Modern Horse.' Illustrated.

The Edinburgh Review (No. 420. April 1907. Longmans). 'Lord Acton's Lectures on Modern History.' 'Peasant Studies in French Fiction.' 'The Land Question.' 'The Pléiade and the Elizabethans.' 'John Evelyn.' 'Lamartine and Elvire.' 'The Menace of the Desert.' 'Sancta Sanctorum.' Illustrated. 'Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic.'

Digitized by Google

The Contemporary Review (Nos. 496–8. April–June 1907. Horace Marshall). H. Paul: 'Is Literature Dying?' A. S. Peake: 'The Problem of the Old Testament.' G. Constant: 'Ferdinand Brunetière.' S. H. Mellone: 'The Present Crisis in Christian Morals.' J. Quail: 'The Investments of the Masses.' A. E. Keeton: 'The Jew in Music.' A. M. Fairbairn: 'Experience in Theology: a Chapter of Autobiography.' Reviews. 'Hobhouse *Morals in Evolution.*' 'Lodge *The Substance of Faith allied with Science.*' 'Workman *Persecution in the Early Church.*' 'E. F. Scott *The Fourth Gospel.*' 'Lockyer *Education and National Progress, 1870–1905.*' May. E. Crawford: 'Berthelot.' P. Sabatier: 'The Montagnini Papers.' J. A. M. Macdonald: 'Our Armaments: a Plea for Reduction.' G. F. Barbour: 'Dogma and Progress.' L. M. Phillipps: 'The Arab in Architecture.' A. T. Schofield: 'The Measurement of Nerve Force.' A. Brown: 'Jesus on His own Vocation.' H. Ellis: 'The Spanish People.' W. Wybergh: 'Imperial Organisation and the Colour Question' (*continued* June). J. E. G. de Montmorency: 'Country Schools for Town Children.' Reviews. 'Bussell *Christian Theology and Social Progress.*' 'R. W. Dale *History of English Congregationalism.*' June. G. G. Coulton: 'Priests and People before the Reformation,' I. L. G. Chiozza Money: 'The Investments of the Masses.' H. Rashdall: 'The Alleged Immanence of God.' Reviews. 'G. M. Trevelyan *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic.*' 'C. Booth *Old Age Pensions and the Aged Poor: a Proposal.*' 'Gamon *The London Police Court To-day and To-morrow.*' 'Lock *Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity, and Evolution.*'

The Monthly Review (Nos. 79–81. April–June 1907. Murray). M. Gorki: 'New York, the City of the Yellow Devil.' G. A. B. Dewar: 'The Ruskin Copyright.' G. S. Street: 'Ghosts of Piccadilly—the Great Duke' (*continued* May, 'Harriot Mellon'; June, 'The Palmerstons and Cambridge House'). J. Ross: 'Galileo in the Val d'Arno.' Mgr. Count Vay de Vaya: 'Alien Immigration to the United States of America.' May. 'The Irish University Question.' A. Symons: 'A Forgotten Poet—John Clare.' A. E. Keeton: 'Wanted—Music Critics.' M. F.-C.: 'Should Women Emigrate?' T. D. Hall: 'A Budget of Roman Letters—Seneca to Lucilius.' A. L. Ellis: 'Mr. Sutro's "Morality" Plays.' A. R. Orage: 'Discipline in Elementary Schools.' A. P. Nicholson: 'Vanishing London.' 'W. Raleigh *Shakespeare.*' June. A. Symons: 'Great Acting in English.' Miss Julia Marlowe and Mr. E. Sothern. E. Sternheim: 'Spinoza—an Essay.' L. S. Garrett: 'The Essence of Hardyism.' An attack on Mr. Hardy's works. F. Clay: 'Art as a Factor in the Struggle for Existence.' E. A. Pratt: 'The Conversion of Westminster.' Slum work.

The Catholic World (Vol. LXXXV. Nos. 505–7. April–June 1907. New York). G. M. Searle: 'The Recent Results of Psychical Research' (*continued* May–June). W. J. Kerby: 'Human Nature and Social Questions' (*continued* May–June). F. Klein: 'Ferdinand Brunetière.' F. A. Gasquet: 'Some Victims of the great French Revolution' (*continued* May–June). Reviews. 'Mgr. Bonomelli (Bishop of Cremona *On Religious Worship and some Defects in Popular Devotions.*' 'Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,*' I. May. J. A. Ryan: 'Is the

Digitized by Google

Modern Spirit Anti-religious?' V. M. Crawford: 'The France of René Bazin.' E. L. Taunton: 'The Old Roman Chant.' June. T. J. Gerraro: 'The Ænigmatic Vision' (I Cor. xiii 12). M. Turmann: 'Recent Developments in France.' Reviews. 'A. Galton *Church and State in France.*' 'Lapponi *Hypnotism and Spiritism.*' 'Briggs *Psalms.*'

The Churchman (Vol. XXI. Nos. 17–18. May–June 1907. Elliot Stock). R. B. Girdlestone: 'Gnosticism: Ancient and Modern.' Reviews Sir O. Lodge and Rev. R. J. Campbell. G. S. Streatfeild: 'The Witness of Pentecost to the Claims of Christ' (*continued* June). G. E. White: 'Saint-Worship to-day in Asia-Minor.' H. M. Wiener: 'Notes on Hebrew Religion, III.' W. H. Griffith Thomas: 'The New Theology and Protestant Orthodoxy.' W. E. Chadwick: '*The Manufacture of Paupers.*' June. J. H. Knowles: 'India's Special Claims.' D. G. Whitley: 'The Image of God in Man.' C. F. Rogers: 'The Scientific Study of Pastoral Theology.' 'J. P. Maud *Preparation for Confirmation.*'

The English Historical Review (Vol. XXII. No. 86. April 1907. Longmans). J. B. Bury: 'The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogennetos.' G. O. Orpen: 'Motes and Norman Castles in Ireland.' G. B. Hertz: 'England and the Ostend Company.' P. Vinogradoff: 'F. W. Maitland.' H. S. Cronin: 'The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards.' In English from a MS. at Trinity Hall, Cambridge. C. H. Firth: 'Two Letters addressed to Cromwell.' Reviews. P. V. M. Benecke: 'Workman *Persecution in the Early Church.*' Important. J. B. Bury: 'J. Peisker *Die älteren Beziehungen der Slawen zu Turkotataren und Germanen.*' 'Destroys the results of Lippert's *Social geschichte Böhmens.*' E. Gwynn: 'Windisch *Die altirische Heldensage Táin Bo Cúalnge.*' Lengthy. E. Barker: 'Bréhier *L'Église et l'Orient au Moyen Age: les Croisades.*' H. W. C. Davis: 'Hanquet *La Chronique de S. Hubert dite Cantatorium.*' W. H. St. J. Hope: 'Lethaby *Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen*'; 'O. Redlich *Rudolf von Habsburg.*' R. S. Rait: 'C. L. Kingsford *Chronicles of London.*' J. Gairdner: 'H. A. L. Fisher *Political History of England*, 1485–1547.' K. D. Vernon. 'M. Schipa *Il Regno di Napoli al Tempo di Carlo di Borbone.*' E. H. Parker: 'A. Launay *Journal d'André Ly, prêtre chinois*, 1746–63. Texte latin.' T. W. Jackson: 'Ungherini *Manuel de Bibliographie biographique et d'Iconographie des Femmes célèbres.*' 'Medlycott *India and the Apostle Thomas.*' 'Workman and Pope *Letters of John Hus.*' G. McN. R[ushforth]: 'Thureau-Dangin *La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e^ siècle*, III.'

The Economic Review (Vol. XVII. No. 2. April 1907. Rivingtons). J. Carter: 'First Impressions of India.' N. B. Dearle: 'Immigration and Transmigration.' E. Raikes: 'L'Abbé Rambaud.' A. Mercer: 'Unemployment, I.' L. A. M. P. McCracken: 'Infant Mortality.' Reviews. L. L. Price: 'J. B. Crozier *The Wheel of Wealth.*' B. L. Hutchins: 'H. Bosanquet *The Family.*' J. Carter: 'Rowntree and Sherwell *The Taxation of the Liquor Trade*, I.'

The Classical Quarterly (Vol. 1. No. 1. April 1907. Nutt). E. O. Winstedt: 'Mavortius and Prudentius.' A. N. Jannaris: 'The Digamma, Koppa, and Sampi as Numerals in Greek.'

The Classical Review (Vol. XXI. Nos. 3–4. May–June 1907. Nutt).

Digitized by Google

J. E. Sandys: 'Friedrich Blass.' T. W. Allen: 'Bassi *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae.*' T. Hodgkin: 'Negri *Julian the Apostate*' [E. T.]. June. W. Rhys Roberts: 'P. S. Allen *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi.*' F. Haverfield: 'Macdonald and Park *The Roman Forts on the Bar Hill, Dumbartonshire.*' H. L. Bell: 'Greek Papyri.' Reviews 'Mayser *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri*' and other works.

Revue Biblique Internationale (Vol. IV. No. 2. April 1907. Paris: Lecoffre). M. J. Lagrange: 'La Crète ancienne. I. Les palais crétois.' Illustrated. M. van Hoonacker: 'Notes d'exégèse sur quelques passages difficiles d'Osée' (*suite*). Hos. x. 9–10, xi. 4, 6–7, xii. 4–7, xiii. 1–2. H. Coppieters: 'Le décret des Apôtres (Act. xv. 28–9).' II. P. Dhorme: 'I Sam. xiii., Critique textuelle et littéraire.' L. Delaporte: 'L'évangéliaire héracléen de Horus.' M. J. Lagrange: 'Les papyrus araméens d'Eléphantine.' P. Dhorme: 'L'arbre de vérité et l'arbre de vie.' M. Abel: 'Document épigraphique sur le patriarche Eustochios.' H. Vincent: 'A propos d'une inscription relative à S. Etienne'; 'Musil *Karte von Arabia Petraea.*' M. Abel: 'Von Soden *Die Schriften des N.T.*' H. Coppieters: 'E. Gigot *Special Introduction to the Study of the O.T.*' M. J. Lagrange: 'Heigl *Verfasser u. Adresse des Briefes an die Hebräer*'; 'Hummelauer *Commentarius in Paralipomenon I.*' 'Faïtlovitch *Mota Muse* (La Mort de Moïse) texte éthiopien avec traduction hebraïque et française.'

Revue Bénédictine (Vol. XXIV. No. 2. April 1907. Maredsous). A. Wilmart: 'L'*Ad Constantinum Liber primus* de S. Hilaire de Poitiers et les *Fragments historiques.*' G. Morin: 'Le *Te Deum*, type anonyme d'Anaphore latine préhistorique?' Discusses Dom Cagin's *Te Deum ou Illatio.*' R. Ancel: 'La disgrâce et le procès des Carafa.' D. de Bruyne: (1) 'Un MS. complet du IV Esdras.' At Brussels, Nos. 9107–9110. (2) 'Le prologue inédit de Pélage à la première lettre aux Corinthiens.' Mgr. Mercati: 'Il codice Corviniano delle Epistole di S. Ignazio.' G. Morin: (1) 'Pour un prochain volume d'Anecdota.' (2) 'H. Brewer *Kommodian von Gaza.*' U. Berlière: 'Le cardinal Nicolas de Cuse dans le diocèse de Liège (1451–2).' Comptes rendus. 'Aicher *Das A.T. in der Mischna.*' 'Mangenot *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.*' H. Leclercq: 'A. Michel *Histoire de l'Art.* II. *Formation, expansion et évolution de l'Art Gothique.*' Favourable.

Revue de l'Orient Chrétien (N.S. Vol. II. No. I. 1907. Paris). L. Guerrier: 'Un "Testament (éthiopien) de Notre Seigneur et Sauveur Jésus Christ" en Galilée.' MSS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. Eth. 51 and Brit. Mus. Or. 793. Mgr. A. Scher: 'Analyse de l'histoire de Rabban bar 'Edta' (*fin*). F. Nau: (1) 'Analyse de deux opuscules astrologiques attribués au prophète Esdras et d'un calendrier lunaire de l'A.T. attribué à Esdras, aux Egyptiens et même à Aristote.' MSS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. graec. 2149, 22, 2494 and Suppl. 636: 2286: 2149, Suppl. 1191, 1148; (2) 'Histoire des solitaires Egyptiens: MS. Coisl. 126'; (3) 'Une ancienne traduction latine du Bélinous arabe (Apollonius de Tyane) faite par Hugo Sanctelliensis et conservée dans un MS. du XII^e siècle.' MS. Paris. Bibl. Nat. lat. 13951. F. Tournebize: 'Étude sur la conversion de l'Arménie au Christianisme ainsi que sur la doctrine et les usages de l'église arménienne

Digitized by Google

primitive.' S. Vaillié: 'Les Eglises saint-Etienne à Jérusalem.' L. Leroy: 'Notes sur deux ouvrages de Sévère Ibn al-Moqaffa (histoire des conciles).' F. Nau: 'Mangenot *L'authenticité mosaïque du Pentateuque.*'

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique (Vol. VIII. No. 2. April 1907. Louvain). Dom C. Baur: 'L'entrée littéraire de S. Chrysostome dans le monde latin.' P. Doncœur: 'Les premières interventions du Saint-Siège relatives à l'Immaculée Conception' (xii^e–xiv^e). A. Fierens: 'La question franciscaine. Le MS. II. 2326 de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, II.' L. Willaert: 'Négociations politico-religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays-Bas catholiques (1598–1625). II. Intervention des souverains anglais en faveur du protestantisme.' Comptes rendus. E. Tobac: 'Juncker *Die Ethik der Apostels Paulus*, I.' G. Rasneur: 'A. d'Alès *La théologie de S. Hippolyte.*' C. Bauer: 'F. Cavallera *Le Schisme d'Antioche* (IV^e–V^e siècle) et *S. Eustathii episcopi Antiocheni in Lazarum, Mariam et Martham Homilia.*' G. Voisin: 'Weigl *Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien.*' E. van der Mynsbrugge: 'Kehr *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum.*' A. Monin: 'A. Knecht *System des justinianischen Kirchenvermögenrechtes.*' Dom C. Mohlberg: 'J. Kösters *Studien zu Mabillons römischen Ordines.*' M. Jaquin: 'Hellmann *Sedulius Scottus*' et 'Rand *Johannes Scottus*'; 'Halm *Thomas Bradwardinus u. seine Lehre von der menschlichen Willensfreiheit.*' A. Fierens: '*Analecta Franciscana*, IV.' Lengthy. G. Mollat: 'Soranzo *La guerra fra Venezia e la S. Sede per il dominio di Ferrara.*' A. de Ridder: 'Thureau-Dangin *La Renaissance catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle, III.*'; 'T' Serclaes *Vie de Léon XIII*, III.' G. Doutrepont: 'J. Favre *Lacordaire orateur, sa formation et la chronologie de ses œuvres.*'

Revue des Questions Historiques (No. 162. April 1907. Paris). A. d'Alès: 'La question baptismale au temps de S. Cyprien.' G. Guillot: 'Léopold I^er et sa Cour (1681–4).' Baron de Maricourt et A. Driart: 'Une abbaye de filles au XVIII^e siècle: Gomerfontaine.' H. du Bourg: 'Religieux et Monastère persécutés au XVIII^e siècle.' P. Bliard: 'La guerre aux émigrés: un épisode de la jeunesse du P. Loriquet.' J. Viard: 'La fiscalité pontificale en France au XIV^e siècle.' L. Maitre: 'Une coalition religieuse en 1792 chez les Bretons.' Dom F. Cabrol: 'Swete *The Apocalypse*'; 'Burkitt *The Gospel History and its Transmission*'; 'Durell *The Christian Church*'; 'Abbott *Silanus the Christian*'; 'Bigg *Wayside Sketches in Ecclesiastical History*'; 'Hodgkin *Political History of England to the Norman Conquest*'; 'Innes *England under the Tudors*'; 'Gasquet *Parish Life in Mediæval England.*'

Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses (Vol. XII. No. 2. March–April 1907. Paris: Picard). L. de la V. Poussin: 'Çāntideva *Introduction à la Pratique des futurs Bouddhas*, VI.' G. Herzog: 'La conception virginale du Christ.' F. Cumont: 'Notes de mythologie manichéenne: I. La séduction des archontes; II. L'omophore.' A. Loisy: 'Harnack *Lukas der Arzt*'; 'Sanday *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*' (unfavourable); 'Mayer-Luther *Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*'; 'Dujardin *La source du fleuve chrétien: I. Le judaisme*'; 'Schweitzer *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*'; 'Baentsch *Altorientalischer u. israelitischer Monotheismus*'; 'Dibelius *Die Lade Jahves*'; 'Batiffol *L'Enseignement de Jésus*'; 'Thieme

Digitized by Google

Die christliche Demut, I.' J. Burel: 'Buonaiuti *Lo Gnosticismo, Storia di antiche lotte religiose*'; 'Grisar-Ledos *Histoire de Rome et des Papes au moyen âge*. May–June. H. Hemmer: 'La Doctrine des Douze Apôtres (Didache).' 'Mgr. Darboy et le Saint-Siège, documents inédits.' A. Dièz: 'Gomperz *Die Lebensauffassung der griechischen Philosophen u. das Ideal der Inneren Freiheit*.'

Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique (Nos. 4–6. April–June 1907. Paris: Lecoffre). G. Michelet: 'Contingentisme et Apologétique néo-positiviste.' 'P. Dhorme *Choix de textes religieux assyro-babyloniens, transcription, traduction, commentaire*.' May. L. Maisonneuve: 'Un cardinal philosophe, Mgr. Mercier.' L. Desnoyers: 'Papyrus juifs araméens du V^e^ siècle avant J.-C.' (*continued* June). 'Piat *De la Croyance en Dieu*.' Lengthy. Mgr. Batiffol: 'Le Gnosticisme d'après M. Bonaiuti (*sic*).' Notes et Critiques: 'Le Cardinal Newman.'

Studi Religiosi (Vol. VII. Nos. 2–3. March-April, May–June, 1907. Florence). A. Palmieri: 'Le condizioni politico-religiose della Polonia russa.' D. Battaini: 'Il rinascimento cattolico in Inghilterra,' II. (*continued* May). S. M[inocchi]: 'Razionalismo e Razionalisti—una questione di Vocabolario.' S. Minocchi: '*Le Profezie d'Isaia*, con una Lettera del Cardinale Svampa.' 'Versione d'Isaia lx. 22–lxvi. 24.' Reviews. 'Harnack *Lukas der Arzt*.' 'J. B. Carter *The Religion of Numa*.' H. Marucchi *Eléments d'Archéologie chrétienne*.' 'J. A. Bain *The New Reformation*.' 'Bonomelli *On Religious Worship and some Defects in Popular Devotions*.' May–June. L. Visconti: 'La conversione religiosa—saggio di psicologia.' 'Gli Atti dei Martiri autentici e spuri.' 'Houtin *La crise du clergé*.' 'Le Morin *Vérités d'hier? La théologie traditionnelle et les critiques catholiques*.' 'E. le Roy *Dogme et Critique*.' I. G[uidi]: 'F. Martin *Le livre d'Hénoch*.' 'Vacandard *L'Inquisition. Étude historique et critique sur le pouvoir coercitif de l'Eglise*.' 'F. Klein *La découverte du Vieux Monde par un Etudiant de Chicago*.' 'La Pontificia Commissione biblica e il Quarto Vangelo.' S. Minocchi: (1) 'La Cosmogonia Biblica'; (2) 'Genesi ii. 4–13.'

Teologisk Tidsskrift (Vol. VIII. Nos. 2–3. 1907. Copenhagen). V. Ammundsen: 'Studier over vore Reformatorers Nadverlære.' Reviews. F. Torm: 'Kähler *Zur Bibelfrage*.' Lengthy. N. M. Plum: 'Reinhardt *Prinzipienlehre der luth. Dogmatik*, 1700–50.' A. Mollerup: 'H. J. Brunhes *Ruskin et la Bible: pour servir à l'Histoire d'une Pensée*.' No. 3. E. Geismar: 'Hegel.' M. J. Gjessing: 'Kirkeligt Liv i Norge 1905–6.' J. P. Bang: 'W. James *Religiose Erfaringer*.' L. Glahn: 'J. O. Andersen *Kirkeorganisation udenlands*.'

The Church Missionary Review (Vol. LVIII. Nos. 696–8. April–June 1907. C.M.S.). 'The Science of Religion.' Reviews recent works by Mr. L. T. Hobhouse, Major Leonard, Dr. F. B. Jevons, and Prof. Gwatkin. 'John Shaw Burdon.' May. 'The Abolition of 1807—a Question and a Reminder.' A. G. Frazer: 'Education as a Means of Evangelization.' T. Walker: 'Present Religious Awakenings in the Church in India.' June. Archbishop of Canterbury: 'The Kingdom of God is come upon You.' Sermon at 108th Anniversary of C.M.S. H. W. Weatherhead: 'Education in Central Africa.' A. F. Painter: 'The Call of the Indian Outcastes.'

Digitized by Google

The East and the West (Vol. V. No. 18. April 1907. S.P.G.). Sir E. Satow: 'Christian Missions in China and Japan.' Bishop A. G. S. Gibson: 'Polygamy and Christianity in S. Africa.' J. H. Maclean: 'Is Hinduism conducive to Unworldliness.' C. F. Andrews: 'The Junior Clergy Missionary Associations.' A. Lankester: 'The Pioneer Work of Medical Missions.' Archbishop of Brisbane: 'A New Mission to the Australian Aboriginals.' J. Kennedy: 'St. Thomas and his Tomb at Mylapore.' E. Stock: 'The Red Indian Missions in N.W. Canada: their first half-century.' D. Ellison: 'Some Aspects of Education in S. Africa: a Reply.' Reviews. 'A. M. Stoddart *Life of Isabella Bird (Mrs. Bishop).*' 'G. K. Scott Moncrieff *Eastern Missions from a Soldier's Standpoint.*'

Books Received.

The more important will be reviewed in short notices or articles as space permits.

Biblical and Kindred Studies.

Cheyne, T. K.—*Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel.* Pp. xx+592. (A. and C. Black.) 15*s.* net.

Fleming, J. D.—*Israel's Golden Age: the Story of the United Kingdom.* 'Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.' Pp. 160. (T. and T. Clark.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

Grimme, H.—*The Law of Hammurabi and Moses. A Sketch.* Translated from the German together with a translation from the Babylonian of the Laws discussed, and chapters on *The History and Archæology of the Hammurabiand Mosaic Codes.* By W. T. Pilter. Pp. 150. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.*

Harnack, A.—*Luke the Physician: the Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.* Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. 'Crown Theological Library.' Pp. xii+232. (Williams and Norgate.) 6*s.*

'Kalamos.'—*Prophetical Suggestions, being Expository of the Books of Revelation and Daniel.*' Pp. xvi+760. (London: Digby, Long & Co.)

Kelly, W. (the late).—*An Exposition of the Gospel of Mark.* Edited, with Additions, by E. E. Whitfield. Pp. vi+282. (Elliot Stock.) 5*s.* net.

Pusey, E. B. (the late).—*The Minor Prophets with a Commentary explanatory and practical, and Introductions to the several Books.* Vol. VI. Habakkuk and Malachi. Pp. 290. (Nisbet.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net. The last volume of an interesting reprint.

Ragg, L. and L.—*The Gospel of Barnabas.* Edited and translated from the Italian MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna. With a Facsimile. Pp. lxxx+500. (Clarendon Press.) 16*s.* net.

Redpath, H. A.—*The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel.* With Introduction and Notes. 'Westminster Commentaries.' Pp. xlii+276. (Methuen.) 10*s.* 6*d.*

Sharpe, S.—*Historic Notes on the Books of the Old and New Testaments.* Pp. xii+312. (Stock.) 6*s.* net. Fourth edition.

Streane, A. W.—*The Book of Esther.* With Introduction and Notes. 'Cambridge Bible.' Pp. xxxvi+80. (Cambridge University Press.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Digitized by Google

SWETE, H. B.—*The Apocalypse of St. John.* The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. Second edition. Pp. ccxx + 338. (Macmillan.) 15*s.* See Review of 1st edit. April 1907. The second embodies some corrections.

WHITHAM, A. R.—*Readings in Old Testament History.* Pp. xii + 362. (Rivingtons.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

WIENER, H. M.—*Notes on Hebrew Religion.* Pp. 32. (Stock.) 6*d.* Reprinted from *The Churchman.*

WILLIAMS, A. L.—*The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon.* 'Cambridge Greek Testament.' Pp. lxxiv + 208. (Cambridge University Press.) 3*s.*

METAPHYSICS AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

CHILD, T.—*Root-Principles in Rational and Spiritual Things.* Second Edition. Pp. 142. (Allenson.) 6*d.*

DAVIDSON, W. L.—*The Stoic Creed.* Pp. xxiv + 274. (T. and T. Clark.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

DE STEIGER, I.—*On a Gold Basis: a Treatise on Mysticism.* Pp. xvi + 350. (London: P. Wellby.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

FROMMEL, G.—*Études morales et religieuses.* Pp. 374. (Saint-Blaise: Foyer Solidariste.) 3 fr. 50.

JAMES, W.—*Pragmatism: a New Name for some Old Ways of Thinking.* Popular Lectures on Philosophy. Pp. xiv + 310. (Longmans.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

STRAUS, R.—*The Dust which is God: an Undimensional Adventure.* Pp. 62. (Norwich: Samurai Press.) 2*s.* net.

APOLOGETICS.

ANDERSON, SIR R.—*In Defence: a Plea for the Faith.* Pp. xvi + 198. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 5*s.*

BROCKINGTON, A. A.—*Old Testament Miracles in the Light of the Gospel.* With an Introductory Note by the BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER. Pp. xvi + 144. (T. and T. Clark.) 3*s.* net.

BROWNE, A. B.—*The New Testament Books: a Fair Field and No Favour.* Pp. 32. (S.P.C.K.) 3*d.*

REDPATH, H. A.—*Christ, the Fulfilment of Prophecy.* Pp. 48. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

ABBOTT, G. F.—*Israel in Europe.* Pp. xx + 534. (Macmillan.) 10*s.* net.

CLARK, J. W.—*Liber Memorandorum Ecclesie de Bernewelle.* With Introduction by (the late) F. W. MAITLAND. Pp. lxiv + 392. (Cambridge University Press.) 15*s.* net.

FIGGIS, J. N.—*Studies of Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius.* Pp. viii + 258. (Cambridge University Press.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

LEWIS, A. S., and GIBSON, M. D.—*Forty-one Facsimiles of dated Christian Arabic MSS.* With Text and English Translation. 'Studia Sinaitica, XII.' With Introductory Observations on Arabic Calligraphy by D. S. MARGOLIOUTH. Pp. xxii + 82. (Cambridge University Press.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

METCALFE, W.—*Origen the Teacher.* Being the Address of Gregory

Digitized by Google

the Wonder-Worker to Origen, together with Origen's Letter to Gregory. Translated with Introduction and Notes. Pp. 96. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

SAINTYVES, P.—*Les Saints successeurs des Dieux.* 'Essais de Mythologie chrétienne.' Pp. 416. (Paris: Nourry.) 6 fr.

STEPHENS, VERY REV. W. R. W. (the late) and CAPES, W. W.—*The Bishops of Winchester.* I. Birinus to Stigand. II. Walkelin to Gardiner. Illustrated. Pp. vi+88. (Winchester: Warren & Son. London: Simpkin.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net. Reprinted from the *Winchester Diocesan Chronicle.*

STOKES, G. T. (the late).—*Ireland and the Celtic Church.* A History of Ireland from St. Patrick to the English Conquest in 1172. Sixth edition, revised by H. J. LAWLOR. Pp. xvi+382. (S.P.C.K.) 5*s.*

TURNER, C. H.—*Ecclesiæ Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima. Canonum et Conciliorum græcorum Interpretationes latinæ.* II. 1. *Concilia Ancyritanum et Neocæsariense.* Pp. xii+144. (Clarendon Press.) 18*s.*

WILBOIS, J.—*L'Avenir de l'Église russe: essai sur la crise sociale et religieuse en Russie.* Pp. viii+304. (Paris: Bloud.) 4 fr.

DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY.

BROWN, W. A.—*Christian Theology in Outline.* Pp. xvi+468. (T. and T. Clark.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

BUCKLE, H.—*The After Life: a Help to a Reasonable Belief in the Probation Life to come.* Pp. viii+296. (Stock.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

HALL, F. J.—*Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.* Pp. xlii+274. (Longmans.) 6*s.* net.

HARRISON, F.—*The Creed of a Layman. Apologia pro Fide mea.* Pp. vi+412. (Macmillan.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

HEDLEY, RIGHT REV. J. C. (Bishop of Newport).—*The Holy Eucharist.* Pp. xx+278. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

LAING, C. E.—*Some Teachings of the Book of Common Prayer.* Pp. viii+316. (Lincoln: W. K. Morton.)

SCOTT, M.—*Crux Crucis: the Problem of the Atonement.* Pp. 128. (Simpkin, Marshall.) 1*s.*

STEWART, H. F.—*Doctrina Romanensium de Invocatione Sanctorum.* Being a Brief Inquiry into the Principles that Underlie the Practice of the Invocation of Saints. With Introduction by the BISHOP OF SALISBURY. Pp. 112. (S.P.C.K.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

TALLACK, W.—*The Scriptural Limitations of the Friends' Doctrine of the Sacraments.* Pp. 18. (London: Headley Bros.) 2*d.*

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

ELLISON, J., and WALPOLE, G. H. S.—*Church and Empire: a Series of Essays on the Responsibilities of Empire.* With Preface by the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. Pp. xvi+240. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

HEADLAM, S. D.—*The Socialist's Church.* 'Labour Ideal Series.' Pp. viii+84. (G. Allen.) 1*s.* net.

LEIGHTON, J. A.—*Jesus Christ and the Civilization of To-day.* The Ethical Teaching of Jesus considered in its Bearings on the Moral Foundations of Modern Culture. Pp. xii+248. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Digitized by Google

MATTHEWS, S.—*The Church and the Changing Order.* Pp. x+256. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

RAUSCHENBUSCH, W.—*Christianity and the Social Crisis.* Pp. xvi+428. (The Macmillan Co.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROSEGGER, P.—*My Kingdom of Heaven.* Pp. viii+330. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 6*s.*

DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

BRETT, G. (the late).—*Fellowship with God.* Edited, with a Prefatory Memoir, by J. BRETT. Pp. viii+140. (Mowbray.) 2*s.* net.

CARUS-WILSON, MRS. A.—*Redemptor Mundi.* A scheme for the Missionary Study of the Four Gospels. Pp. viii+102. (Hodder and Stoughton.) 1*s.*

DE BARY, R.—*Mystical Fellowship: the Science of Christliness.* A Catholic Eirenicon from the Exponents of the Mystical Gospel of Brotherliness. Pp. xx+300. (Longmans.) 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

HALL, C. M.—*The Life of a Christian.* Some Suggestions for Short Studies in the Spiritual Life. With Introduction by the BISHOP OF MILWAUKEE. Pp. xii+132. (Longmans.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

LEJEUNE, P.—*Holy Communion: Preparation and Thanksgiving.* Pp. 380. (Paris: Lethielleux. London: Burns and Oates.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

MOLINOS, MICHAEL DE.—*The Spiritual Guide which Disentangles the Soul.* Edited, with an Introduction, by (the late) K. LYTTELTON, with a Note by H. S. HOLLAND. Pp. xxii+204. (Methuen.) 2*s.* A welcome addition to the 'Library of Devotion.'

RICHARDSON, G. L.—*The Travail of His Soul.* A Three Hours' Meditation for Good Friday. Pp. viii+68. (Mowbray.)

SHARPE, G. H.—*Thoughts for the Thankful: Little Helps to a Habit of Thankfulness.* Pp. viii+140. (Wells Gardner.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

A Day-Book of Short Readings for Use by Busy People. Trinity to Advent. By the Author of *Præparatio.* With Preface by G. CONGREVE, S.S.J.E. Pp. xvi+436. (Masters.) 6*s.* net.

LITURGICA.

MITCHELL, E. H.—*Prayer-Book Saints and Holy Days.* Pp. 124. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.*

WALKER, E. T. M.—*The Popes and Ordination.* Pp. 40. (London: W. Knott.) 1*s.* net.

WESTON, F. H.—*The Prayer Book in the Making, or the Plain Man's History of the Book of Common Prayer.* Pp. vi+216. (Murray.) 5*s.* net.

Forms for Children's Service. Sanctioned by the BISHOP OF EXETER. Pp. 26. (S.P.C.K.) 1*d.*

CHURCH MUSIC.

POTT, F.—*Free Rhythm Psalter.* Pp. 424. (Frowde.) 3*s.*

SMYTHE, F. H. D.—*The Choir Psalter.* Being the Cathedral Psalter, containing the Psalms of David together with the Canticles and Proper Psalms pointed for Chanting, with Explanatory Notes and Paragraphs. Pp. xxvi+270. (Novello.)

WALPOLE, G. H. S.—*The People's Psalter,* containing the Psalms of David, together with the Litany and the Canticles and Hymns of the Church, with *Cathedral Psalter* Pointing. Pp. xvi+300. (Stock.)

Digitized by Google

List of Approved Church Music for the Archdiocese of Westminster. Pp. viii + 104. (Burns and Oates.) 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sermons and Addresses.

Bethune-Baker, J. F.—*The Old Faith and the New Learning : Ready To-day to give an Account concerning the Hope which is in You.* Addresses to Ordination Candidates, Advent 1906. With Introductory Note by the Dean of Westminster. Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

Brown, C., Walker, W. L., and others.—*God's Garden.* Sermons for Harvest and Flower Festivals. Pp. viii + 278. (Manchester : J. Robinson.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gibson, Right Rev. E. C. S. (Bishop of Gloucester).—*The Old Testament in the New.* 'Warburtonian Lectures,' 1903–7. Pp. xii + 194. (Wells Gardner.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

Inge, W. R.—*Death the Fulfilment of Life.* Pp. 16. (Stock.) 6*d.* Preached before the University of Cambridge, March 3, 1907.

Jelf, G. E.—*'Sound Words' : their Form and Spirit.* Addresses on the English Prayer-Book. Pp. 256. (S.P.C.K.) 3*s.* 6*d.*

Mortimer, A. G.—*One Hundred Miniature Sermons.* Being a very full Outline Sermon on the Epistles and Gospels for all the Sundays, Holy Days, and Saints' Days of the Christian Year. Part IV. Pp. 165–334. (Skeffington.) 2*s.* net.

Richardson, G. L.—*Sermons for Harvest.* Pp. 96 (Skeffington.) 2*s.* net.

Winnington-Ingram, Right Rev. A. F. (Bishop of London).—*The Call of the Father.* Pp. viii + 248. (Wells Gardner.) 1*s.*

General Literature and Biography.

Alston, L.—*The White Man's Work in Asia and Africa : a Discussion of the Main Difficulties of the Colour Question.* 'Maitland Prize Essay,' 1906. Pp. x + 136. (Longmans.) 3*s.* net.

Atkinson, J. C. (the late).—*Forty Years in a Moorland Parish : Reminiscences and Researches in Danby in Cleveland.* Reprinted with Portraits, and Prefatory Memoir by G. A. Macmillan. Pp. xlviii + 470 (Macmillan.) 5*s.* net. A most welcome reprint. See Article *C.Q.R.* (July 1892).

Davis, F. H.—*The Persian Mystics : Jalálu'd-dín Rúmí.* 'Wisdom of the East' Series. Pp. 106. (Murray.) 2*s.* net.

Edwards, J. H.—*God and Music.* Pp. 320. (Dent.)

Frommel, G.—*Etudes Littéraires et Morales.* Pp. viii + 332. (Saint-Blaise : Foyer Solidariste.) 4 fr.

Jebb, Sir R. C. (the late).—*Essays and Addresses.* Pp. vi + 648. (Cambridge University Press.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Masterman, G. F. G.—*Frederick Denison Maurice.* 'Leaders of the Church, 1800–1900.' Pp. xii + 240. (Mowbray.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Morrison, J.—*New Ideas in India during the XIXth Century : a Study of Social, Political, and Religious Developments.* Pp. xiv + 282. (Macmillan.) 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Raleigh, W.—*Shakespeare.* 'English Men of Letters.' Pp. vi + 232. (Macmillan.) 2*s.* net.

Digitized by Google

RUSSELL, G. W. E.—*Dr. Pusey.* 'Leaders of the Church, 1800–1900.' Pp. xii + 214. (Mowbray.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

SMYTHE PALMER, A.—*Some Curios from a Word-Collector's Cabinet.* Pp. vi + 198. (Routledge.) 2*s.* 6*d.*

THOMSON, E. I.—*Recollections and Letters of the Rev. W. H. E. McKnight.* Pp. xii + 372. (Masters.) 6*s.*

†., F. G. F.—*The Steep Ascent: Memorials of Arthur Heber Thomas and Records of the Ramnad Mission, S.P.G.*, 1532–1906. With Prefatory Note by E. GELL. Pp. xiv + 262. (Bemrose.) 5*s.* net.

MISCELLANEOUS.

CAILLARD, E. M.—*The Garden, the Wilderness and the City.* Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

ELFFERS, H.—*Impressions by the Way.* Pp. 224. (Cape Town: J. C. Juta & Co.)

HAMPSON, W.—*Modern Thraldom: a New Social Gospel.* Pp. xii + 162. (Wells Gardner.) 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

HENRY, S.—*Christus Redivivus.* Pp. 148. (London: Drane.) 5*s.* net.

HERVEY, LORD FRANCIS. *Corolla S. Eadmundi: the Garland of S. Edmund K. & M.* Pp. lxiv + 672. (Murray.) 10*s.* 6*d.* net. Beautifully produced.

INGLISH, G.—*The New Theology, or What is Man?* Pp. 16. (Walter Scott.) 1*d.*

JOHNSON, G. B.—*Freedom through the Truth.* An Examination of Rev. Dr. A. V. G. Allen's *Freedom in the Church.* Pp. vi + 80. (Longmans.) 1*s.* net.

KIDD, W.—*The Sense of Touch in Mammals and Birds with Special Reference to the Papillary Ridges.* Pp. viii + 176. (A. and C. Black.) 5*s.* net. With 164 Illustrations from Drawings and Micro-photographs.

LEVY, S.—*Original Virtue and other Short Studies.* Pp. x + 178. (Longmans.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

OSWALD, L.—*My Little French Friends.* Illustrated. Pp. viii + 84. (Moring.) 2*s.* A charming little book of stories, songs, etc., in easy French.

PRATT, E. A.—*The Licensing Trade: an independent Survey.* Pp. x + 330. (Murray.) 5*s.* net.

SABATIER, P.—*Lettre ouverte à S.E. le cardinal Gibbons à propos de son Manifeste sur la séparation des Églises et de l'État en France.* Pp. xx + 84. (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher.)

SMITH, A. H.—*The Uplift of China.* With a supplementary chapter upon the work of the C.M.S. Pp. xii + 304. (C.M.S.) 2*s.* net.

STRACEY, M. H. R., and HOSTE, M. R.—*Divine Stories, or Hidden Truths.* A Book for Boys. Pp. 96. (S.P.C.K.) 1*s.* 6*d.*

STURGE, C. Y.—*Points of Church Law and other Writings illustrative of the Law of the Church.* Pp. xvi + 156. (Macmillan.) 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hints to Parsons. By A PARSON. Pp. 38. (S.P.C.K.) 6*d.*

The Magazine of Christian Art. Vol. I. No. 1. April 1907. Pp. 38. (London: Bemrose.) 2*s.* An American magazine with good illustrations.

The Quiver, June 1907. (Cassell & Co.) 6*d.* Five Hundredth Number.

Digitized by Google

INDEX TO VOL. LXIV

ABBEYS, The Unpopularity of the, 370 *sqq.*: popular notions about monastic institutions, 370; original object of monasteries, 371; life of monks under the Benedictine Rule, 372; the abbey of St. Albans: powers and 'rights' of its abbots, 374 *sq.*; its monopolies, 376; growth of the town of St. Albans (formerly Verulam), *ib.*; the townsfolk's opposition to the abbey's claim of jurisdiction, 377; its attempt to make the town surrender old charters of rights: the mill question, 378; the abbey's quarrel with the Friars, 379; William Grindecobbe's attempt to recover the town's liberty, 380; outbreak of the Peasant Revolt: the abbot's fright, 381; the King commands him to restore their lost charters to St. Albans, 382; a mob forces the hesitating Abbot to yield, 383; fate of the charter *De Libertatibus Villanorum*, 384; trial of Grindecobbe, 387; his execution, 388; the abbeys became a social incubus, 390

Abbott, Rev. Dr., *Silanus the Christian*, 435

Alston, Mr. L., *Christian and Stoic in the Second Century*, 454

BALLINGER, Mr. J., *The Bible in Wales*, 227

Beet, Rev. Dr. J. A., *A Manual of Theology*, 229

Benedictine Abbey of Westminster, The, 58 *sqq.*: Widmore's work (1751) on the history of the Abbey, 58; Dean Stanley's *Memorials*, 59; Mr. Lethaby's recent work: tracing the craftsmen who built the Abbey, 60; their nationality, 61; imitation of the best points in the great churches of France, *ib.*; Mr. Lethaby's account of original forms of various parts of the Abbey, 63; the topography of the precincts, 65; the social life of the dwellers in the buildings: information afforded by the Customaries, 66; account of John Islip, the last Abbot, 67; his interest in the building operations of the Abbey, 70; the discussion about the 'Jesus Chapel,' the 'Jesus Mass' and 'Jesus anthem,' 71; Islip's chantry, 73; the five altars, 74; description of the Abbot's funeral, 75; the Islip Roll, 76; Islip's successor: changed conditions of the Abbey, 78

Benson, Mr. A. C., *Edward FitzGerald*, 479; *Walter Pater*, 480

Books received, Notes on, 251, 495

Bradley, Mr. A. C., *Captain John Smith*, 242

Butler, William Archer, 301 *sqq.*: his birth and upbringing (as a Roman Catholic), 302; he joins the Church of Ireland, 304; enters Trinity College, Dublin: his reputation there, *ib.*; poetical temperament: his

Digitized by Google

Remembrances of a Poetical Childhood, 305; religion held a foremost place in his heart, 306; his 'Laconics,' 308; his poem *The Voice of Friendship*, 310; thoughts on the choice of a profession, 311; promoted to a professorship in Philosophy: ordained deacon, 312; his wholly strenuous life, 313; his lectures, the *History of Ancient Philosophy*: appreciation of critics, 314; his indefatigable parochial work, 315; preferred to the living of Raymochy, 316; his sermons: their matter and style, 317; eagerly sought for as a preacher: best remembered by his sermons, 318; introduction to Wordsworth, 320; defence of Mr. Gladstone in connexion with 'the Pusey heresy,' 322; the *Letters on Development*, 323; how these were received, 324; Butler's own Church principles, 325; a speech on Church education, 326; the treatment of the famishing multitudes in the famine of 1846, 327; Butler's views on faith, 330

CHILDREN, Books about, 391 *sqq.*: the cult of childhood at least coeval with Christianity, 391; reasons for the prevalent taste for the nursery and its details, 392; Mr. W. H. Hudson's *A Little Boy Lost*, 394; why this taste was not satisfied before, 395; children in past ages: the Tudor period, *ib.*; Puritanism: John Wesley's mother's method, 396; children's literature in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, 397; Miss Edgeworth's stories, 398; Evangelical writers: Mrs. Sherwood's *The Fairchild Family*, 399 *sq.*; characteristics of her work, 400; Mrs. Ewing: an outcome of the Tractarian Revival, 401; her *Six to Sixteen*, *ib.*; her love for the home, 402; *Daddy Darwin's Dovecot*, and *The Story of a Short Life*, *ib.*; Mr. Kenneth Grahame's *The Golden Age*: the child interpreted from within, 403; the author's characteristics, 404; Mr. Pater's *Child in the Home*, *ib.*; childlike spirit of Mr. Stevenson's *A Child's Garden of Verses*, 405; Mr. Barrie is the most accurate observer of children: *The Little White Bird*, *ib.*; the study of a boy's conscience in Mrs. Dearmer's *The Noisy Years*, 406; the children in Mrs. Nesbit's *Oswald Bastable* and *The Treasure Seekers*, *ib.*; a home with good nursery discipline in Mrs. Allen Harker's *The Romance of a Nursery* and *Concerning Paul and Fiammetta*, 407

Church Quarterly Review, The: Past and Present, 1 *sqq.*: chief aim of its original promoters (1875), 1; need of the wider dissemination of sound knowledge on religious questions, 2; how the *Review* has supplied this need, *ib.*; its articles on Apologetic literature, *ib.*; Home Mission work, 3; the requirements of Foreign Mission work, *ib.*; necessity for the increase of the diocesan episcopate, 4; Ecclesiastical Courts: the alleged 'disloyalty' of a section of the clergy, 5; relations with other Churches, 5 *sq.*; articles on liturgical and doctrinal studies, 6; a comprehensive survey of modern movements in Philosophy, History, Music, Art, Literature and Science, 7; the question of anonymity of contributors, 8; the numerous distinguished writers who have supplied articles to the *Review*, 8 *sqq.*; reasons for lowering its price, 10; its standard will not be lowered, 11

Clarke, Mr. J. L., *The Eternal Saviour-Judge*, 452

Digitized by Google

DEA

DEARMER, Mrs., *A Child's Life of Christ*, 230

Denmark, the Church of, 80 *sqq.*: early relations of the Church of England and the Danish Church, 81; King Cnut sends many bishops and priests to Denmark, 83; English monks help towards the creation of Christian culture there, *ib.*; growth of German ascendency in Denmark, 84; Reformation epoch, 85; several resemblances and differences between the English and the Danish Churches: the Articles, 87; likeness of liturgy and ritual, 89; later position of the Episcopate, *ib.*; possibilities of mutual intercourse, 92; literary relation of the Danes with England, 93; recent increasing communication between England and Denmark, 93; Danish religious parties, 96; present Church government: Frederic VII.'s 'Ground Law,' 100; the limits of intercommunion of the two Churches, 104

Dennett, Mr. R. E., *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, 460

ECCLESIASTICAL Courts, 13 *sqq.*: the conclusions of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 13; the charge they had to investigate, 14; the working of the present Ecclesiastical Courts, 15; real cause of the failure of prosecutions for ritual offences, 16; question of appeal from the courts, 17; Henry VIII.'s Statute of the Submission of the Clergy, 18; the Court of Delegates, 19; its functions transferred to the Privy Council, 20; Churchmen's objection to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Privy Council, *ib.*; the Council claims the function of determining the law of the Church, 22; appeal in litigation in Ecclesiastical Courts which involves property, 24; ecclesiastical sentences involving suspension and deprivation: the system which prevails in Scotland, 26; both Commissions (1881, 1906) hold that the existing system of courts as a working system cannot be maintained, 27; their proposals of reform of the Diocesan and Provincial Courts, 28; the final Court of Appeal, *ib.*; appeal to the Crown, 29; the fundamental principles which govern this matter, 30; the control which the High Court of Justice exercises over Ecclesiastical Courts, 32; a final court truly ecclesiastical suggested, 33; the language of the Statute of Appeals and of the Statute of Submission, 34; Mr. Justice Phillimore's opinion, 35; relative positions of the 'High Church' and the 'Low Church' parties, 38; need of making more elastic the existing law of ritual and ceremonial, 39

EUR

Eck, Rev. H. V. S., *Sin*, 445

Elton, Professor O., *Frederick York Powell*, 239

Euripides and his Modern Interpreters, 156 *sqq.*: the recent rehabilitation of Euripides, 157; Browning's translations, *ib.*; former treatment of Euripides in England, 158; appreciation of several of his dramas, 159; recent works on him by Dr. Verrall, Mr. Gilbert Murray, 160; Prof. Paul Decharme, Mr. W. H. S. Jones, 161; object of Dr. Verrall's volumes, *ib.*; the purpose and effect of the poet's plays, 162; modern depreciation of Euripides is partly due to his querulous tone, 163; Dr. Verrall's view that the *Andromache* is a 'second volume,' 164; his treatment of the play commonly called *Helen*, 165; of *Heracles Mainomenos*, 166; the *Orestes*, *ib.*; Mr. Gilbert

Digitized by Google

EVO

Murray's English verse-translations of Euripides, 167

Evolution and Morality, 331 *sqq.*: criticism of Dr. Westermarck's *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 331; his dictum that 'there are no general moral truths,' 332; on the origin of the moral emotions: 'tribal custom was the earliest rule of duty,' 333; three different opinions expressed by the author, 334; his examples of 'meaningless' statements, 335; his argument proceeds on ambiguity, 336; Mr. Hobhouse's *Morals in Evolution*: the author's view of what is 'good' for each man, *ib.*; of the 'ultimate basis of morals,' 337; what he means by 'the rationality of morals,' 338; the gap between the good of the individual and the good of society, 339; there is a tendency, he thinks, to their harmony, *ib.*; but the philosophical problem is to discover how to harmonize them, 340; the form of development which is best for the individual, 341

GASQUET, Abbot, *Parish Life in Mediaeval England*, 236

Gospel History, The, and its Transmission, 169 *sqq.*: Mr. Burkitt's work on the subject, 169; Dr. Salmon's posthumous work, *The Human Element in the Gospels*, 171; Dr. Abbott's *Silanus the Christian*, Harnack's *Luke the Physician*, 172; evidence that our Four Gospels were accepted as Scripture in the year 150, 174; criticism of Mr. Burkitt's theory that the early Christian Church took very little interest in the historical Christ, 176; the *Didache* clearly presupposes the existence of a Gospel, 177; the speech of St. Peter in Acts x.

LOC

36 *sq.*, 178; Mr. Burkitt's parallel arguments in regard to St. Paul's Epistles, 179; the growth of the Canon of the Gospels, 180; the date at which the several Gospels were written, 181; St. Luke and St. Mark, 181 *sqq.*; the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, 184; priority and historical value of St. Mark's narrative, 185; Dr. Salmon's view as to St. Mark being the interpreter of St. Peter, 186; the origin of those portions of St. Matthew and St. Luke which are not contained in St. Mark, 187; Dr. Salmon's theory, 188; the sections of St. Luke's Gospel which are peculiar to it, 189; Dr. Salmon on the story of the Gadarene swine, and on the raising of Lazarus, 190 *sq.*; Mr. Burkitt's views, 192; bearings of these criticisms on the faith of a Christian, 193; the several grounds of their investigations asserted by the writers we have quoted, 194; basis of our belief in the Divine character and Personality of Christ, 195; attitude of the devout Christian with regard to miracles, 197

HALL, Rev. H. E., *A Longer Catechism*, 450

Herrmann, Prof. W., *Communion with God*, 452

Hone, Mr. N. J., *The Manor and Manorial Records*, 473

Hyde, Rev. Dr., *From Epicurus to Christ*, 455

JACKSON, Rev. H. L., *The Fourth Gospel and some recent German Criticism*, 440

LEA, Dr., *History of the Inquisition in Spain*, 468

Leonard, Major, *The Lower Niger and its Tribes*, 462

Lock, Mr. R. H., *Recent Progress in the Study of Variation*, &c., 458

Digitized by Google

LOD

Lodge, Sir O., *The Substance of Faith allied with Science*, 447

MARKHAM, Sir C., *A Memoir of Archbishop Markham*, 476
Moore, Rev. Dr. K., *The Way to Teach the Bible*, 233
Mortimer, Rev. Dr., *Confession and Absolution*, 451
Moulton, Dr. J. H., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 441

NEW COLLEGE and King's: a Study in Reform, 39 *sqq.*: the origins of the four foundations, Eton and King's, and New College and Winchester, 41; connexion between the two colleges and the schools which respectively fed them, 42; some bad results of methods of Wykeham and Henry VI., 43; lines of reform, 44; effects of the new statutes (*Ordinances*), 45; the part borne in the reforms by Mr. Augustus Austen Leigh, 46; the functions of a Tutor at Cambridge, *ib.*; solution of similar problems at New College, 47; the changes, 48; question of the restriction of celibacy from holders of Fellowships, 49; how it was solved by both Colleges, 50; matters dealt with by the two University Commissions (1877-79), 51; the value and tenure of Scholarships and Fellowships, 52; Mr. Leigh's efforts to carry out reforms, 54; Mr. A. Robinson's similar labours at New College, 55
New Theology, The (notice of the Rev. R. J. Campbell's book), 409 *sqq.*: the author's irreverent parodies of popular religious thought, 410; his statement of the main purpose of the book, 411; his definition of the meaning of God, *ib.*; a return to the Gnostic difficulty, 'How can the Infinite become finite?' 412; the terms 'infinite' and 'finite' only express the limitation of our intellect, 413; God is self-limited, *ib.*; Mr. Campbell's conception of God is not the Christian conception, 414; he implicitly denies the Fatherhood of God, 415; the relation of man to God: 'the ultimate Self of the universe is God,' 416; his claim that his doctrine is not Pantheism but a Monistic idealism, *ib.*; his treatment of sin and evil, 418; what he means by sin, 419; difficulty of grasping his theory of evil, *ib.*; on the 'theological muddle' caused by the Christian doctrine of sin, 420; Mr. Campbell's patronizing eulogy of our Lord, 422; his views on the Divinity of Christ: the 'Divine Man,' the 'eternal Christ,' 423; Mr. Campbell has perverted and exaggerated Christian truth, 424; his treatment of the Atonement, 425; 'there is no theory of the Atonement in the New Testament,' 426; but why and how has the world learnt it? 427; the lesson mankind has learnt from the Cross of Christ, 429; the fundamental error underlying Mr. Campbell's writings, 430; what is his ultimate authority? 431; the Bible has lost the position it held with Protestants, 432; Mr. Campbell's opinion that 'Religion is necessary to mankind but Churches are not,' 433; but it is in the Churches that the Christian ideal is most perfectly realized and most adequately represented, *ib.*; why this new theology fails, 434

OMAN, Prof. C., *The Political History of England*, vol. iv.; *The Great Revolt of 1381*, 465

Digitized by Google

PALLADIUS and Egyptian Monasticism, 105 *sqq.*: the literature of early monasticism, 106; objects of the monastic life, 108; consideration of some origins assigned, 108 *sq.*; Paul of Thebes and his disciples, 109; the daily life of the recluses, 110; growth of the standard of austerity, 111; their primary aim was perfection, to be attained by escape from all worldly distractions, 112; manner of life of Chronius and his disciples: how their spiritual needs were provided for, 113; how the prerogatives of 'confessors' worked out, 114; growth of practices of austerity; 116; asceticism in clothing, 117; food, 119; their longevity, 120; their dwellings ('monasteries'), 121; the delusions to which the monks were often subject, 122; the 'wonders' reported by Palladius, 122 *sq.*; belief in the attacks of visible demons, 124; the doctrine of guardian angels, 125; despite their separate lives, the monks had always the consciousness of neighbourhood, *ib.*; Pachomius, the completer of Antony's work: his Rule and its successors, 120

Paul, Mr. H., *A History of Modern England, V.*, 477

Periodicals, 243, 485

Pullan, Mr. Leighton, *The Church of the Fathers*, 465

RELIGIOUS Crisis in France, The, 198 *sqq.*: examination of Canon Henson's condemnation of the Church in France, 199; his inference from the General Elections, 200; comparison of elections in France and in England, 201; political aims of the French voter: he did not believe that religion was attacked, 202; how he was deceived, 203; the opposition to the Inventory-making, 204; characteristics of the manifestations, 205; the schismatic object of *Associations cultuelles*, 206; treatment of leases to curés of confiscated churches, 207; the Prefect's jurisdiction over curés' presbyteries, 208; the machinery of French Freemasonry, 211; the present day Test Act in France: *not* to go to Mass, 213; signs of general dissatisfaction among various classes, 215; real feelings of the agricultural classes, tradesmen and business people, 216; the meaning and power of Freemasonry in France, 217; illustrative examples of its methods of influencing elections, 218; the class of deputy it requires, 219; the people's blind following of the Government, 220; impossibility of unsectarian Christianity in France, 221; religious schools are still well attended, 222; proofs that the hold of the Church on the people of France is firm, 223

Richmond, Rev. W., *The Gospel of the Rejection*, 440

Ritchie, Prof. D. G., *Philosophical Studies*, 456

Roscoe, Sir H. E., The Life and Experiences of, 238

ST. DAVID and the Early Welsh Saints, 277 *sqq.*: the golden period of the Welsh Church, 277; Romano-Celtic origin of the Cambro-British Church, 278; development of parish churches from monasteries, 279; the principal monasteries, 280; the life of St. Illtyd, Abbot of Llantwit and tutor of St. David, 282; legend of his rescued deer, 283; St. David (or Dewi): story of his birth, 284; his studies under Illtyd at Llantwit and Paulinus at Whitland, 285; the conference (at Brefi) between the orthodox and

Digitized by Google

the Pelagian clergy, 285; David's address to the assembly and its results, 286; he succeeds Dubricius as primate and arch-abbot (Caerleon), 287; removes the mother-see to Menevia, *ib.*; his rule of his monastery and his own manner of life, 288; the 'Synod of Victory,' 289; the saint's death, *ib.*; his posthumous fame: his title of patron saint of Wales, 290; fame and sanctity of his shrine, 291; account of St. Teilo and the 'Teilo churches,' 292; a relic of the saint still preserved, 293; life and work of Padarn, disciple of St. David, 294; St. Deiniol, first bishop of Bangor, 295; St. Asaph, disciple of the Scottish saint Kentigern, 296; story of St. Winifred, *ib.*; the legend of her well, 297; few female saints in the early Cambro-British Church, 299

Scott, Mr. E. F., *The Fourth Gospel*, its Purpose and Theology, 438

Seccombe, T., and Nicoll, W. R., *The Bookman Illustrated History of English Literature*, 478

Snagge, Lady, *Simple Talks to Little Children on Holy Subjects*, 234

Sweating of Women's Labour, London Home Industries and the, 128 *sqq.*: a typical gathering of London Home Workers, 128; description of the women, their trades, their very small earnings, 129 *sqq.*; various causes which bring so many women into home industries, 136; sub-sweaters and their 'apprentices,' 137; the cases here are fairly representative, 138; mental and physical characteristics produced in the sweated, 139; yet they are good women, moral, honest, sober, 141; causes which lead to the sweating of women, 142; difficulty of fixing the blame, 143; methods of the 'Season' trades, 144; proposals suggested towards lessening the sweating evil, 145; some objections to these, 146; proposed establishment of a *minimum wage*, 148; decent housing is an essential if sweating is to be abolished, 151; the housing scheme of the Home Workers' Aid Association, 154

Swete, Rev. Dr., *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 224

THIRTY Years' War, The (Cambridge Modern History, Vol. IV.), 235

UNIVERSITY of Durham, The Future of the, 257 *sqq.*: earlier foundations, 257; first steps (1831) towards the present foundation: object of the promoters, 258; gradual formation (1832–42) of the regulations for the government of the University, 259; powers vested in the Dean and Chapter, 260; the Commission (1861) 'to provide for the better government of the University': its Ordinances disallowed, 261; regulations made by a Statute of Chapter (1865) *ib.*; expense of students reduced: consequences, 262; the Armstrong College (of Physical Science), Newcastle, affiliated, *ib.*; efforts towards transference of powers of government from the Chapter to the Senate, 263; Bishop Westcott's proposed conference on the subject rejected, 264; ultimate result: the Bill of 1907, 265; the different status of a local and of a national University, 266; how the Bill makes the University completely autonomous, 267; the 'Council of the Durham Colleges,' *ib.*; conditions of admission to degrees, 268;

Digitized by Google

the re-constitution of the Senate, *ib.*; power of affiliating other colleges, 269; question of study of Latin and Greek, 270; the Church's interests in the University, 271; need of religious freedom, *ib.*; proper independence and autonomy guaranteed by the proposed constitution, 273; the harmonizing of Durham and Newcastle, 274; high standard of Matriculation and of real learning desiderated, 276

WISDOM Literature, The Theology of the, 342 *sqq.*: general point of view of the Wisdom writers, 342; their concern with 'Hokmah' (Wisdom), 343; the 'Humanists' of Israel, *ib.*; they write as students of life, 344; the Wisdom writers' treatment of the Nature and Being of God, 346; their general assumption that God exists, 347; their Divine Being compared with the God of the Prophets, 348; the Divine order in the world, 350; the forces of Nature act in ceaseless obedience to the Divine will, 351; the Divine order in its relation to the moral life of Man, *ib.*; the Psalmists and Jeremiah greatly perplexed by the prosperity of the wicked, 353; how the Book of Job is to be estimated, 354; Eschatology of the Wisdom Literature: death, 355; the idea of Immortality, 356; two passages in Job, 357; the doctrine of the Book of Wisdom, 358; none of the five books is wholly devoid of all suggestion of Immortality, 359; Man in relation to God, 360; the services which the writers rendered: they checked exclusive nationalism, 361; mitigated rigid legalism, 362; contributed a positive element of Philosophy, Criticism and Reflection, 363; prepared the way for Christianity, 364; in the 'Hokmah' school the personified Divine Wisdom bears a resemblance to the 'Word' who was made flesh at the Incarnation, 365; their religious individualism, 366; the foreshadowing, in Job, of the life and Person of the Saviour, 367; the Wisdom of the Hebrews was a veritable Charisma, 368

Wyndham, Right Hon. George, *Ronsard and La Pléiade*, 241

Spottiswoode & Co. Ltd., Printers, New-street Square London

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

MAY 10 1946

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

MAY 10 1946

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google